THE

CHARACTER OF JESUS PORTRAYED.

A BIBLICAL ESSAY,

WITH AN APPENDIX.

BY DR. DANIEL SCHENKEL,
PROFESSOR OF THEOLOGY, HEIDELBERG.

"The one, special, and deepest theme of the history of the world and of mankind, to which all else is subordinated, is always the conflict of scepticism and faith."
GOETHE.

TRANSLATED FROM THE THIRD GERMAN EDITION,
WITH INTRODUCTION AND NOTES,
BY
W. H. FURNESS, D. D.

VOL. I.

THE CINCINNATI BIBLE SEMINARY
LIBRARY

BOSTON:
LITTLE, BROWN, AND COMPANY.
1866

232.9
S324c
V.1

Entered according to Act of Congress, in the year 1866, by
LITTLE, BROWN, AND COMPANY,
in the Clerk's Office of the District Court of the District of Massachusetts.

32914

University Press: Welch, Bigelow, & Co.,
Cambridge.

INTRODUCTION

BY THE TRANSLATOR.

THERE is nothing in all history that equals in interest the inquiry into the truth concerning Jesus of Nazareth, confessedly the most extraordinary person who has appeared among mankind. Among the great he stands, by common consent, the greatest; unsurpassed, unapproached in those qualities which alone penetrate to the deepest in man's nature, to his veneration and his faith. Without reference to any benefits to be derived from it, the attempt to ascertain, as nearly as may be, the exact historical truth concerning him is, simply on account of the commanding interest of his person, its own exceeding reward, a bountiful over-payment for the time and labor it may take, and for all the difficulties of the attempt, aggravated as they are by ignorance, superstition, the pride of knowledge, and sordid self-interest.

But the inquiry into the historical truth, the actual facts, of the life of Jesus is in no degree less important than it is interesting. It is no matter of private taste. It is vital to the cause of a sound theology and to the best interests of mankind.

Whence come the religious errors that flood the Christian world, the false notions that deprave the sense of truth, shackle the minds of men, and forever stand in the way of a full recognition of the perfect freedom of thought which it is every man's right to enjoy and his duty to use? Are they not all traceable, as is so well stated in the first chapter of this work, to the false views entertained of Jesus, of his nature and office, of his relations to God and man? It is wonderful that it is so, — wonderful that one human, unofficial, and, under some aspects, obscure life should be the cardinal

fact in the religious history of the race. But so it is. The simple, historical truth is, that the intellectual, moral, and religious condition of the Christian world is at this hour determined by the thoughts which men have of Jesus. Now, as false ideas of him are so prolific in generating error in regard to matters of the greatest concern, from the true idea of his life and character will there not in like manner come just ideas, — just ideas on all subjects, a sounder philosophy, a purer religion, a larger spiritual liberty? The truth breathed into the world through his name, — in other words, the inspiration of the ideas which his person, among all known symbols of the invisible, really and most impressively represents, — will it not lead us, as we cannot otherwise be led, into the way of all truth?

What, then, can be more important than the endeavor to see Jesus as he actually was? Is it not the one fundamental inquiry? What interest can be felt in combating the erroneous doctrines that prevail, so long as the essential facts, from ignorance or misconception of which they spring, so far from being justly appreciated, are not yet clearly ascertained? Not that the fallacies of these false doctrines may not be fully shown. Not that it is not worth while to have them shown. But the result of such showing does but little to advance us. It is purely negative. And besides, has not our liberal Christianity so called been diligently doing this work, — for how long now? Our modern arguments against popular religious errors may be found stated with unsurpassed ability in tracts written nearly two hundred years ago. Why should we be continually doing this work over and over again, haunted, as we all are, young and old, the right wing as well as the left, with the painful consciousness, growing deeper and deeper, that the main glory of our liberal body is as yet hardly anything more than the barren distinction of a triumphant denial? This uneasy consciousness is shown by some in an outright return to the weak and beggarly elements of the orthodox faith, which has at least the attraction of being affirmatory, — pos-

itive, however falsely so ; by others, again, in laborious efforts at organizing the liberally inclined, mainly for the collection of moneys for we know not what grand enterprises; in erecting a costly trellis when there is no vine springing to grow over it and cover it with its clusters; if not in trying over again the old, shattered spell of a creed, yet in contending for phrases, articulations of human breath. Still the difficulty remains. The deep-seated want of a positive, life-giving faith is not met.

In vain are the attempts, incessantly repeated, to frame some verbal statement, to set forth some large view of Christianity, that will prove satisfactory to all liberally disposed persons, and furnish them with a bond of union, a centre of denominational life. If such a statement, having the harmonizing and inspiriting effect, without the restraint and exclusiveness, of a creed, be possible, — which is very doubtful, — if Christianity will ever admit of being defined as a form of opinion, — I have no idea that it does or will, — certainly no satisfactory definition of it can be looked for so long as the central position from which alone it can be seen as it is — the Life of Jesus — is not reached and squarely taken. This is the one indispensable preliminary to whatever knowledge of Christianity, as a system of doctrine, is possible. How, in simple terms, can we know what the religion of Jesus was, but by knowing who and what he was himself?

This, then, must be settled before anything else can be settled, — *the historical truth concerning Jesus.* Let us seek the foundation upon which alone we can build. Or, rather, to use a more correct figure of speech, let us discover the fact, alive with the indestructible force of truth and nature, the living germ in history, which, finding a congenial soil in the heart, will grow and bring forth life-giving fruit. We shall then be, not indoctrinated, but, what is far better, inspired, by Jesus, just as his personal disciples were. He did not initiate them into any system of thought. They had very mistaken views, which they retained to the last. What

he said they hardly understood. What he *was* went right to their hearts. By the admiration, reverence, and love which his personal character commanded, he took possession of the very centre and citadel of their being, and reinforced that with new life, with extraordinary power. Thus in sympathy with his personal life, they learned to know the quality of a world-embracing love, of a victorious faith, of an immortal hope. And although their understandings were only imperfectly enlightened, their errors were neutralized as their hearts dilated with these divine inspirations. Thus did he become to them wisdom, and righteousness, and sanctification, and redemption.

But so long as, in respect to our modes of thinking and our moral convictions even, we are so much at the mercy of the time, of the social influences and institutions that have so large a part in forming us, we can but very imperfectly appreciate the profoundly human and humane significance of the history of Jesus. German scholarship is excellent, and so is the vivacity of the French and the vigor of the English mind. But with the little knowledge I have obtained of the life of Jesus, and with the light, above the brightness of the sun, shed by the recent great history in which we have all in this country, men and women, been sharers, I cannot think that the history of Jesus, "the man of the people,"—that Christianity, the very ideal of democracy, —is to find its full exposition among those whose whole manner of thinking has been moulded, from their cradles, by the influence of aristocratic and monarchical institutions. There was no need that M. Renan should avow himself the friend of the Old-World systems of government. His *Vie de Jésus* left us in no doubt on that score.

Among the parallelisms of history, there is none more instructive than that which runs between the history of the first age of the Christian era, on the one hand, and this recent national history of ours, our thirty years' war for humanity, on the other. It is hardly less than a revelation. How wonderfully do these two great passages illumine each

other! If there is any one point upon which the light of recent events falls with concentrated power, it is on the pages of the New Testament. That light sweeps grandly on into the future, and the heart of every man of us, as we turn our eyes in that direction, swells within him under the sense of a transcendent destiny. But that light sweeps as grandly back into the past, over the dust of kings and the ruins of empires, and is found to be one with the light that radiates from the immortal person of the Man of Nazareth. There and here it is the humanity of man vindicated, and consecrated by a great baptism of suffering and blood.

And yet the wisest and most learned of other lands, they who claim to give the law to mankind, and to whom we are wont to look up as pupils to their teachers, the Carlyles and Gladstones, the men of letters, of Church and of State, never recognized the risen Christ, but mistook death for life. And how can we hope that the true history of Jesus will be read for us by those whose eyes have been blinded from birth by the glitter of privileged orders and aristocratic institutions.

I do not hesitate, therefore, I hasten to say, it is to a land whose social institutions are based upon principles, Christlike, Godlike, — in that they regard not the person of any man, but honor all men, — that we are to look for the recovery of the truth, — for the true reading of the greatest page in history, the Life of Jesus. Not yet have the equal institutions of this country, disabled as they have been by half a century's alliance with a barbarian despotism, generated the spirit that shall open for us that book of life. But, as our recent history is teaching us, they are gradually working nothing less than an organic change in human nature, enthroning in men's minds, as the commanding principle of human life, the sacred sentiment of human respect, that spirit of humanity, without which the knowledge of God is a pretence; that spirit with which all unequal institutions are forever at war; that spirit, the place of which, in the interpretation of the history of Jesus, no critical appara-

tus, however complete, can supply. When the influence of arbitrary and external distinctions shall be overcome, and we approach the time when the ruling principle of human intercourse shall be reverence for man, then we may hope to fathom the significance of the life of Jesus; and that inexhaustible spring of moral power shall send forth new, all-cleansing, and all-fertilizing streams.

Jesus is not yet known. So greatly is he misunderstood, so destitute of the truth of reason and nature have been the representations that have been made of him, and with such confidence are they imposed upon the world, that now for some time he has become so unsubstantial, that everything like a vivid apprehension of him as an historical person, as a man who once actually existed, seems to have faded away from the general mind.

It is not strange that it is so. All things considered, what could be more in the course of nature than that he should have suffered precisely this treatment? Hardened as we are by custom, our nature is nevertheless very excitable; and whenever it is brought into contact with what is at all out of the usual way, especially with any uncommon manifestation of personal greatness, it is caught up on the outspread wings of imagination, above the simple truth of things, beyond the boundaries of reason. It no longer sees with its eyes or hears with its ears. It is lost in an ecstasy and its own creations take the place of plain facts.

And is not here the reason, by the way, why the whole subject of religion has, in all ages, assumed forms infinitely various, and oftentimes grotesque to the grossest absurdity? This fact not unfrequently leads to the suspicion that it is all folly and superstition, which the wise can look upon only with contempt or indifference. But directly the opposite is the true conclusion to be drawn from the extravagances into which the world runs on this great subject. They show how near it is to our nature, and with what topics of inde-

scribable interest it has to do. It never could have excited mankind as it has done, were it not, of all things, the thing that most profoundly concerns them. Such monstrous imaginations never could have been created and such frenzied passions aroused by a superficial cause. The wisest will always treat religion with the greatest respect.

As it is with religion in general, so is it with the person of Jesus in particular, this great religious fact. Some there are who doubt whether he ever had an existence, — to whom he is unreal, mythical. And the most might as well doubt his existence also, so indistinct is their apprehension of him as a real person. And all because the representations that have been made of him are so glaringly out of keeping with reason and nature. As he has commonly been described, he is so unlike man, so unlike God, so unlike every other existing thing, that it has seemed only natural to suspect that he is a creation of air.

Undoubtedly this irrational representation of the person of Jesus is a fiction, with as little foundation in the record as in nature. But there must have been some cause for the fiction, some reason why men were moved to imagine and to credit it, why the dogmas concerning Jesus that have gained such easy currency in the world came to be fabricated. There must have been something to give them the show of being true. These exaggerated statements could be made of no ordinary person, surely not of no person at all.

Indeed, when I consider that down to this very hour, after the lapse of twenty centuries, the great majority of the foremost communities on the face of the globe are accustomed to regard the young man of Nazareth as nothing less than Almighty God himself; when I see what a hold this idea has taken upon men's minds, although the accounts of him that have come down to us give no ground for it whatever, so far from having the shadow of a doubt cross my mind as to the reality of his existence, I receive an impression, to which no words can give utterance, of the profound vitality of his personal being. It could have been no myth, O no! that

has so moved mankind. Who that has ever lived has penetrated like him to the very centre of our nature, and broken up the unfathomed deeps of human wonder and veneration, kindling the imagination into such a flame about himself, that the ascription to him of the incommunicable essence of the incomprehensible God has seemed to men no exaggeration? I could sooner question the existence of any other man, or of all other men, than his. We, — what are we? We live on the surface, bubbles hurried swiftly away on the rushing tide of time. But he! He lived. He turned the whole mighty current of human history. He planted himself deep in the inmost soul of things, and this great Christendom is throbbing with the breath of his life to this hour. And not only do our Christianities, and Protestant Reformations, and our Landings of Pilgrims taking possession of new worlds and dedicating them *Christo et Ecclesiæ*, and our Declarations of human rights, and our suppressions of huge rebellions against God and man, and whole races emancipated, — not only do these bear witness that Jesus communed with the heart of the world until it burned again; but even these wild vagaries of the imagination, these doctrines of miraculous and immaculate conceptions, and trinities, and double natures, and infinite atonements, and I know not what, — these likewise show what a hand of power must have been laid upon the inmost springs of human thought and feeling by him who has given occasion to such extravagant speculations.

Thus, while the errors, still everywhere prevalent, concerning the person of Jesus have hidden him from sight, they bear testimony, — all the more impressive because indirect, — not only to his reality, but to the unparalleled force of his personal character. And there comes this question of superlative interest, Who was he, of whom it may be stated as a simple historical fact that he has identified with the life of the world, not merely the truths which he uttered, but his own individual idea? Would that our theological systems, all our dogmatics, whether orthodox or liberal, might

be forgotten, while we give ourselves heart and soul to this fundamental inquiry!

If the true idea of Jesus is ever to be recovered with any degree of distinctness, it must be from the literary records that have come down to us, and from them alone.

But these writings are very brief and imperfect. And their obvious simplicity, their unquestionable antiquity, their Oriental origin, and the interval between them and the events they relate being considered, it must be confessed that there is a strong presumption that they are not free from an admixture of the legendary and the fabulous. Nevertheless, they are our sole sources of information in regard to Jesus. Whatever is to be known of him personally, whether much or little, must be gathered from them.

The obscurity that, from the imperfect and antique nature of these records, dims the image of Jesus which they reflect, is increased by the extravagantly false views of their character which the errors that have prevailed in regard to his person have caused to be taken. In order to secure for these errors any show of authority, it has been necessary, in the interpretation of the four Gospels, to set aside the essential laws of human speech; and a warrant for this proceeding has been found in the dogma that these writings, with the rest of the Bible, were, every word and letter, composed under the special and direct dictation of the Holy Spirit. It has been easy, therefore, to gain from the Gospels any idea of Jesus rather than the true one, particularly as this mistaken view of their character has been made a sacred article of religious belief, not to be questioned by any one who was not prepared to encounter the charge of infidelity and irreligion.

Formidable as this charge has been, however, and still is here and there, it was impossible that these mistaken notions of the Christian records should be maintained forever against the numerous and manifest marks of a human origin which these books present. Accordingly it is beginning to

be more and more generally understood that the four Gospels are not miraculous, but purely human compositions. And naturally enough, their value as human compositions merely, as historical documents, has come into question. Thus we have the Life of Jesus by Strauss, first published some thirty years ago, and recently republished in a more popular form for the express use of the countrymen of its author. I am by no means prepared to deny the soundness of the method of Strauss. For as surely as the exhalations of the earth attend the presence of the sun, fables and myths accompany the great events of history that enlighten and kindle the souls of men. There is a portion of the Christian records to which the method of Strauss may with justice be applied; but the error, as it appears to me, of this learned writer is that he carries his method too far, and runs it quite into the ground. Nothing related in the Gospels is suffered to pass without the mythical brand, be it never so natural and credible. He sees nothing but myths. In thus resolving the whole history into air, he leaves no ground even for his own theory to stand upon, and virtually assumes that truth has no chance of being perpetuated, that the mind of man is interested only in fiction, not in fact. Were it so, how vain the desire, how fruitless the attempt to set men right! The old orthodox theologians were not more bent upon finding an article of faith in every text, than Strauss is upon finding a myth at every turn. So relentless is his hunt for this species of game, that, were it not for the marvellous patience and critical gravity with which he pursues it, it might almost seem, as Porson remarked of Gibbon, in relation to the historian's pertinacious assaults upon Christianity, "that he was revenging some personal injury." At all events, I cannot help thinking that, consciously or unconsciously, Strauss is so profoundly impressed, — as it is very natural that he should be, — with a sense of the mischievous influence of the religious errors prevalent under the Christian name, that he is resolved to cut up, root and branch, the authority upon which they profess to depend, and leave them not a twig to hang upon.

But, be this as it may, the aim of Strauss is a perfectly legitimate one. Whatever of the mythical element there is in the Gospels, let us by all means know it, and honor be to him who helps us to this knowledge. In like manner, whatever of the dogmatic element they contain, let us ascertain that also.

But, after all, there is a far more interesting and important inquiry than either of these. Whatever presumption there may be in favor of the mythical or the dogmatic character of the four Gospels, all the stronger is the presumption that they contain historical truth, more or less. Whatever fables or dogmas are discovered in them, the more certain is it that there must be *an historical nucleus or germ of fact*, out of which have sprung these bold myths and these peculiar speculations. What is this historical truth in the Gospels? What is the amount of it? That there is a great deal more of historical fact in the Gospels, by the way, than some modern critics have any idea of, and that it admits of being established in the most satisfactory manner possible, I am most fully convinced. But, whatever the amount of historical truth to be found in these books, here is, I conceive, the question of questions.

Until very recently, however, there has been no disposition to put aside all other aims and engage in the single search for the historical truth in the Gospels, for the fundamental facts of the great case. Indeed the whole matter seems to have been given up in despair. All hope of clearing away, in any degree that would make it worth the trouble, the obscurity in which the person of Jesus, regarded as an historical fact, is wrapt, is by many relinquished.

But a little while ago, a man of high repute in the learned world went upon a scientific mission to explore ancient Phœnicia. He had occasion to sojourn for a while on the borders and to traverse all parts of the native land of Jesus. And one consequence was that, greatly to his own surprise, he was impressed by the "marvellous harmony with the Gospel

ideal of the country which serves it for a frame." The geographical truth of the Gospels broke upon him, he says, as a revelation. He was thus impressed all the more because he was of the number of those to whom Jesus, as an historical person, was of doubtful existence. With the characteristic eagerness of his nation, M. Renan instantly set to work to write the life of the extraordinary person whom he had discovered. What a sensation the publication of his work has made is well known. Considering the effect which it has had, it seems hardly too much to say that it marks a new period in theological inquiry. The idea which it presents of its great subject is indeed very far from being satisfactory; for the particulars related in the Gospels concerning Jesus M. Renan receives with great distrust, and sees no way of understanding them that forbids him to suppose fraud and delusion even at the cost of the moral elevation which he nevertheless, in glowing general terms, ascribes to the character of Jesus. Still Jesus is no longer a wholly mythical person in the eyes of this learned writer. He would fain treat him as a reality. This work is to be welcomed, therefore, and all the more as an attempt made on the extreme left to deal with the Gospels as, in some sense, veritable historical documents. And for a first effort of the kind, proceeding from the sceptical school too, it is rather to be commended for a certain sense of reality which it creates in regard to Jesus, and for so freshening the whole subject that inquiry has been turned with new interest in this direction, than condemned for its numerous and most manifest misrepresentations.

One of the substantial good fruits of the French Life of Jesus is the present work by Dr. Schenkel, which bears witness to the deep interest that the author tells us for five-and-twenty years he has taken in the subject, and which, as he also informs us, would not have been published but for the appearance of the *Vie de Jésus*. The value of this work lies not so much in its particular expositions as in its thorough

fidelity to a purely historical method, in its pervading appreciation of the humanity both of the nature and of the spirit of Jesus, and in a tone of truth and freedom so clear and full that the translator has been quite unable to decline the invitation which it has given him to use a like freedom in his Notes.

Dr. Schenkel has not undertaken to write a Life of Jesus, a work which he pronounces impossible, not to be expected; and I suppose it must be admitted that a biography of Jesus, properly so called, is quite out of the question. That his personal history, however, may be better understood than it is yet, that a much greater approximation may be reached than has yet been made towards a correct understanding and a natural arrangement of such facts as may be verified, and consequently towards a somewhat well-ordered narrative of the Life of Jesus, I have no doubt.

But I am as fully persuaded that this result will be due to no criticism, however learned and acute, which does not find in the personal character of Jesus, (as this great miracle of history and of nature slowly opens upon us,) the principal key to the interpretation of the Gospels, the chief touchstone by which their statements are to be authenticated or disproved, and whatever of error or fable they contain is to be distinguished from truth and fact. As the personal character of Jesus comes to be more and more known, as we penetrate to his personal life, which is the soul of his history, from this interior and central point of view we shall be able to see the events of that history in their just relations, and arrange and harmonize them.

And what, by the way, renders the application of this test much easier than it may at first sight seem is the fact that the character of Jesus is manifestly full to overflowing with the vigorous life of nature. Accordingly he took every object, every incident into himself by a simple, natural, instinctive affinity, and made it so perfectly the vehicle of his thought, the instrument of his act, an illustration, a living member of his own being, that whatever happened to him seems now as

if it were a special providence ministering to his completeness, a necessary component of his life; and the narrative, wherever it is true, pulsates with his breath and his blood.

If the truth of this statement be not felt, it is because the whole study and aim has been to represent him under an aspect the very reverse, to separate him as much as possible from the actual, living truth of things, in order to prove him to be *supernatural*. And thus it is that we are suffering under a great loss, even the loss of that irresistible testimony to his reality and greatness, which, as he himself is recorded to have said, would be borne to him by the spirit of truth, that spirit, one with his own spirit, which reason, which human nature, and which all nature breathes with an unwasting freshness.

This loss may be repaired, but not by any results obtainable in other directions, certainly not by any conclusions that may be reached in regard to those questions upon which German theologians bestow so much learning and labor, — questions respecting the origin and history of the four Gospels.

Even were the inquiry into the origin of these writings more promising than it really is, even if there were a good prospect of their being traced to the hands of those whose names they bear and to dates very near the time when the events related took place, — what then? Is there any weight that may attach to the names of their authors, or to the date of their composition, that would satisfy us of the truth of the facts related, if these facts themselves be not in keeping with the character of Jesus, with human nature, and all the circumstances of the case?

But there is little prospect that the authorship and date of the Gospels will ever be established with any precision. There is no learning that has yet been able to discover any external historical evidence whereby they can be traced nearer to the occurrence of the events narrated than within several decades. Again, what then? Must we give up all hope of knowing what these writings contain, because we cannot tell by whom they were written or put together, or when

they were composed? I saw a little while ago a miniature, apparently of a French gentleman of nearly a hundred years ago, exquisitely painted in enamel, set in gold, and accidentally found under the false bottom of a small battered metallic box resembling an old inkstand, thrown up by some laborers digging a cellar at Valley Forge a year or two since. How it came there baffles all conjecture. Its history is wrapt in inpenetrable darkness. Nevertheless there can be no question of the reality and quality of the work. Now it appears to me that the truth of the four Gospels is just as independent of these questions concerning their origin and history.

But still let these inquiries be carefully pursued. When and by whom were the Gospels written? What have been their fortunes, and what changes have they undergone? These are interesting questions, but they are not the vital questions. So far from their ever being settled by external evidence, it is the internal evidence of the Gospels, their moral harmonies, of which the personal character of Jesus furnishes the chief, that will help us incidentally, but none the less satisfactorily, to a settlement of these very points. And their internal truth may be studied and discovered independently of the names they bear, and even though we should disregard the fact that they are four different works, and, separating them into sections only where they naturally fall apart, should shuffle them all together and examine them piece by piece. Would not what is historical in them still be distinguishable from what is mythical, legendary, or dogmatical? Or, if we are unable to make these distinctions now, may we not hope that a critical sense will sooner or later be developed, that will be able to distinguish the fictitious from the true, art from nature, the work of man from the work of God? Although Dr. Schenkel considers it of the first importance to ascertain the history of the Gospels, he constantly appeals, as he needs must do, to their internal truth, to their moral characteristics, which he terms the "genuinely historical traits," — *die echt geschichtlichen Züge.*

The portions of the Gospels which most embarrass Biblical students are the so-called miraculous relations which they contain. Now, while I am far from denying that the difficulties that invest these relations are great, I cannot help thinking that they are aggravated by our assumption of knowledge in regard to things of which we are beyond all question ignorant. Biblical criticism is hampered no less by philosophical than by theological dogmas. Who will pretend to affirm that we know what life is, and death? There are elements or forces to us unknown, in both. Neither are we authorized by anything that we know to define the precise limits within which the power of the human will acts. In this confessedly imperfect state of our knowledge, are we not bound in reason to treat every alleged fact, however anomalous, that does not involve a self-contradiction, as probable, that is, as capable of being proved? Every day's experience is admonishing us that it is neither safe nor wise to ridicule and reject alleged facts before they are disproved. Before we accord them credit, we may justly require that they shall be established by decisive evidence: but we are not to reject them only because they are anomalous. We are bound in all candor to weigh the evidence presented in their favor; and if it is decisive, we are bound to credit them, wholly out of our power though it may be, in the present state of our knowledge, to classify them.

Strange, inexplicable as seems to us the resurrection of the dead to life, it cannot be affirmed, while we know neither what life is nor death, that, under no possible circumstances, could such an event take place. Let the circumstances then, the conditions, under which Lazarus, for example, is related to have been recalled to life, be fully considered. And if they are found to render the supposition of fraud or delusion impossible, then must we admit the extraordinary fact, under the presumption that, with the advance of knowledge, a broader generalization will be arrived at, by which the anomaly will be brought into harmony with the order of things.

It is not in any dogmatic interest, but solely in its relation to the character of Jesus, that the account of the raising of Lazarus claims to be considered and credited. As on the physical side of the event we are as yet in the dark, the physical discrepancy, — which may therefore be only in appearance, — can weigh nothing against the undesigned consonance of the narrative with the profounder moral truth of things as shown in its several particulars, and most especially in the original idea it gives us of Jesus himself, original in its entire freedom from all exaggeration, all belittling self-consciousness, original and characteristic in the matchless simplicity and ease of nature which marked his whole bearing on the occasion, — here I cannot but have a most vivid sense of reality. The truth, which we may here discern, the author of the story had no thought of expressing. It is naturally and unintentionally involved in the facts stated.

Although the extraordinary events in the history of Jesus are, at present, valuable only as they help to illustrate his person; yet that, when once fully established, they will be found to have an untold worth in themselves, apart from their relation to the moral idea of Jesus, there can be no question, because all facts, all phenomena, have value as illustrations of the mysterious life of which Jesus is the most luminous manifestation. But at present, the chief interest of all the facts of his history lies in their relation to the moral idea of him. Some of the marvellous narratives in the Gospels, as, for example, the stories of his nativity, show no such relation to him, but wear the appearance of fables, whose origin is not difficult of explanation. There are others, again, that bear upon his character only to mar it, and therefore must be supposed to be either too defectively reported to admit of being understood, or to be such exaggerations of ordinary events as were likely to arise under the circumstances.

Most heartily do I agree in the conviction expressed by Dr. Schenkel at the close of his first chapter, that "the com-

prehensive and thorough renovation of the Church which our whole age is laboring for can be accomplished only in harmony with a renovated faith in the true, historical Christ, the Christ living in the history of the world." But such a renovation of faith in Jesus is not possible so long as he is regarded as a supernatural person in any other sense than that in which all men and all things are supernatural, and, being so regarded, is rendered incapable of historical representation. He is of all existences in fullest accord with the truth of nature, — the one point at which the light of nature is concentrated and whence it most abundantly radiates, the central luminary of the human sphere. No visible being has come so near the deep heart there is in us all as he.

It is not in the wide and far-reaching consequences of his life that the most impressive signs of his personal power are visible. Being what he was, it could not be but that his life should tell upon the world as it has done. But every day that I live I am more and more impressed by his unrivalled greatness in this, that he saw and distinguished intuitively the essential truth of things. In all ages, — the present enlightened era is no exception, — the wisest and most prudent are forever confounding temporary institutions, superficial interests, and the speculations of men, with the eternal principles of Right and Truth. But Jesus penetrated as with the eye of a God to the heart of the great mystery of being, and amidst the multitude of human devices clearly distinguished the counsel of the Most High, the mind and will of the Infinite, and lived and died by his faith in it.

Another of the extraordinary wonders in his case is that so many of the particular incidents of his life were so animated by his personality, so luminous and alive with his great personal qualities, that they have impressed themselves indelibly on the memory of the world. We lament that so little can be known of him, that the accounts of him are so meagre. But what is told of him is so pre-eminently and undesignedly personal, that there is no other great man of

whom we may have such intimate knowledge as we may have of him. Other men have said and done great things, uttered immortal sayings; but how little is known of them, and what is known, — how little does it show of a corresponding greatness! But Jesus, on the most ordinary occasions and in the homeliest circumstances, so bore himself, that, although neither he nor his friends thought of making any record of his acts, the memory of them lives to this hour. His life passed at once into the eternal order of things, and took place there as the centre of light and power forever; and his personal being has become the representative of all truth.

When we learn to see him as he was, and rightly to estimate his personal qualities, all so unconsciously portrayed in the Gospels, we shall then, by the sentiments which they create in us, begin to understand the nature and the intimacy of the relation existing in the very nature of things between him and the human soul. He who, alone, has penetrated into the inmost sanctuary of our nature and established himself there, must, consequently, be forever especially identified with the most sacred ideas and interests of mankind, and the religion of man must be Christianity, — "that only true and living faith, whose centre is the historical Christ, and whose rule is conscience." — *Bunsen.*

W. H. F.

[The translator's notes, indicated by (*a*), (*b*), &c., follow the chapters to which they severally relate.]

PREFACE TO THE FIRST EDITION.

It is now just five and twenty years since, in entering upon my duties as a private teacher of theology, I attempted in a lecture for the first time to describe the life of Him who might well designate himself as the "life of the world," in the fullest and most comprehensive sense of the word. Shortly afterwards, in one of the most highly esteemed theological periodicals of Germany, I ventured upon an examination of the works of *D. F. Strauss*, *Weisse*, and *Neander*, relating to the great subject. I was already at that period deeply impressed with the difficulty and importance of such an undertaking, and I had especially become convinced that, without a firm basis to stand upon in relation to the character of the Gospels, even a tolerably correct understanding of the "life of Jesus" is a simple impossibility. At that time also I publicly expressed my first doubts in regard to the authorship of the Fourth Gospel, without succeeding, however, in arriving at a definite and satisfactory conclusion in regard to the character of this enigmatical portion of the New Testament.

But what changes have we not witnessed during these five and twenty years in the department of religion and theology, in our civil and ecclesiastical life! The fresh movement, which at the beginning of this time gave hopes of a healthy development in theological science, is lost in a stagnant slough. Our theological Faculties have, for the most part, become supporters of an obsolete doctrinal system; and our aspiring youth, whose hearts are wont to beat warmly for truth and right, have resigned themselves to the jurisdiction of a tradition no better than that which the Redeemer of the world resisted unto blood. At present an

icy atmosphere envelopes our theological literature, and when the green shoots of scientific endeavor would seem to be budding, they too often prove to be only the offspring of sophistry and artifice, harbingers of a painted spring. Only the more deeply, however, is the longing for religious truth and a Christian life awakened in our religious communities, which, still striving for inward and outward self-renewal, well know that it is in the person of Jesus Christ that this truth and this life have appeared, and that only in connection with Him do the nations find the source of real strength and true exaltation.

In the dreary years of theological retrogression, it has been my need and my solace to dwell upon the life of the Saviour. For this my earlier studies had prepared me, and my regularly returning course of lectures upon "biblical theology" summoned me to renewed efforts in this direction. But I have been particularly interested in those investigations respecting the Gospels, which *Dr. Baur* in Tübingen (too early taken from us) started and pursued in his writings with such manly boldness. Thus I came gradually to have a definite idea of the relation of the four Gospels to one another, and what five and twenty years ago floated dimly before my mind has steadily grown into a firm conviction, namely, that the Fourth Gospel in its present form cannot be a work of the Apostle John, but had its origin in a later school of this Apostle. And now for the first time I have found it possible to complete a portrait of the Saviour upon a sure historical basis. It was, however, I confess, only after much hesitation and years of mental conflict, that I arrived at that result of critical inquiry which lies at the foundation of the present work.

This hesitation was also the main reason why, notwithstanding the investigations that have continued to be carried on respecting the Gospels, I have taken no part in the public discussions of the subject. Perhaps even now this work would not have been published, had not the sensation caused by the "Life of Jesus" by *E. Renan*, forcibly re-

minded me of the necessity of meeting the deep want of our time, which demands a genuinely human, truly historical representation of Jesus. Too little has as yet been done in the German Church to satisfy this need, highly valuable as are the labors of my predecessors. My work makes no claim to the comprehensive title of a "Life of Jesus." It is a delineation of the character of Jesus that I have aimed at. It is the first time that such an attempt has been made from the point of view of the Second Gospel, for even *Renan* has not taken this point of view firmly and with decision. Whether I have succeeded in what I have proposed, it is not for me to decide. In regard to the reception which this work will meet with among the men of tradition, I am under no delusion. But happily among German theologians and in the German Church there are not wanting those who seek only the truth, and who believe not only in the right but in the duty of free inquiry in evangelical theology. To the friendly acceptance and consideration of this class I commend this work. May it help to strengthen and confirm faith in the Redeemer among our people. For that he devoted his whole life to the poor, suffering, and oppressed masses, is shown, I trust, beyond all question in these pages.

The conviction that He is the light of the world has been impressed upon my mind while I have been writing this book with a vividness never before known; and the sadder the present, the more comforting is the certainty that this light will never be extinguished.

DR. SCHENKEL.

HEIDELBERG, Fourth Week of Advent, 1863.

PREFACE TO THE THIRD EDITION.

WITHIN a few months a third edition of this work has become necessary, and, at the desire of the publishers, it appears in a cheaper form, which places it within reach of a larger circle of readers. The favorable reception which it has found claims my cordial acknowledgments, and warrants the belief that, generally speaking, my purpose has been justly appreciated. Violent attacks upon this book, however, have not by any means been wanting. A clerical faction has even erected itself into an ecclesiastical court, published a kind of bull of excommunication, denounced me to all people as an apostate from Christ, and called upon the magistracy for violent measures against me and my official position. That so ridiculous an anachronism should be witnessed in Baden, I had not expected. The publication issued against me, so rude in its tone and calculated for the coarsest nerves, exhibits in its contents an inconceivably low degree of culture in the authors and signers, an intellectual feebleness and moral weakness which I should not have ventured to attribute to that party. My book, from beginning to end, is misunderstood and misrepresented, its conclusions are distorted, and consequences are drawn from it which I certainly never dreamed of. It was not my purpose to present a "doctrine" concerning the person of Christ. That is to be found in my "Christliche Dogmatik." * The investigations pursued by me in this book are of a purely historical nature. The results arrived at certainly have not been obtained from the creed of the Church, neither have they been drawn from my own

* Schenkel, D., Die Christliche Dogmatik von Standpunkte des Gewissens aus dargestellt, 2 Bde.

head, but from biblical sources. I may be wrong; let me be corrected. I may be in error; let my positions be controverted. Denunciations are certainly not arguments, and a charge of heresy is no refutation.

For five and twenty years, according to the humble measure of my abilities, but with an honest will, I have served the cause of the Gospel and the Lord, whom in this book I heartily acknowledge. I have written it solely in the service of evangelical truth, to win to the truth those especially who have been most unhappily alienated from the Church and its interests, in a great measure through the fault of a reactionary party, blinded by hierarchical aims. In seeking to present a portrait of the character of the Saviour, I was bound by the nature of the case to delineate his human side. It is precisely this circumstance which, although the creed of the Church distinctly recognizes the real humanity of Jesus, appears to have kindled the wrath of the men of tradition. It will neither terrify me, nor shall it irritate me, but rather impel me, so far as God gives me power, to spend my last breath in the service of the holy cause of evangelical truth and freedom. I know that in so doing I shall only honor and glorify Him who came into the world to bear witness to the truth.

DR. SCHENKEL.

HEIDELBERG, on John the Baptist's day.

CONTENTS OF VOL. I.

FIRST SECTION.

INTRODUCTION.

Chap.		Page
I.	The Significance of the Person of Jesus and the Representations that have been given of Him	1
II.	The Gospel Authorities	18

SECOND SECTION.

THE DEVELOPMENT.

III.	Jesus before his Public Appearance	57
IV.	The Resolve to enter upon a Public Career	83
V.	The Calling of the Disciples and the first Results	102
VI.	Extended Activity	117
VII.	The open Conflict	133

THIRD SECTION.

THE FIRST INSTITUTION OF A NEW COMMUNION.

VIII.	The Dedicatory Discourse	152
IX.	The Kingdom of God and the Kingdom of the Devil	165
X.	The Disciples tried and sent forth	178

APPENDIX.

Critical and Historical Illustrations 197

FIRST SECTION.

INTRODUCTION.

CHAPTER I.

THE SIGNIFICANCE OF THE PERSON OF JESUS AND THE REPRESENTATIONS THAT HAVE BEEN GIVEN OF HIM.

1. No religion has its fortunes and its results so closely connected with the person of its founder as the Christian religion. The external history of Christianity and its internal throes are inseparable from the name of Jesus Christ. Through this name the shameful instrument of martyrdom on which he died has become the most exalted symbol of human self-sacrifice, honor, and virtue. Christian doctrine has formed its weightiest propositions from the various representations of the person of Jesus which, from time to time, have obtained admission and authority in the Christian community. The different tendencies of thought in the early apostolic church grouped themselves in accordance with the convictions which gained weight therein respecting the founder of the Christian religion. The deep-rooted opposition between Judaism and heathenism, found in the contradictory opinions entertained of the being, significance, and dignity of Jesus its most sharply defined expression. Just as impossible as it was for a right-minded Jew to acknowledge, equally with the one true, invisible God,

another divine being of equal birth, so easy was it for a born heathen to conceive of a number of different divine persons, sharing equally, or in slightly different ways, in the central fulness of one divine nature. Thus, at this one point especially, was kindled the conflict which, lasting for centuries, split the Christian Church in different directions, and into different sects. There is no doctrinal controversy of the Church which, in its deepest roots and latest issues, may not be traced back to a fundamental difference of opinion as to the person of Jesus.

Long before there existed a catholic, that is, a dominant, church, Christian thinkers were divided into two principal parties, of which one was, step by step indeed, but always irresistibly, overpowered by the other. The Jewish-Christian party, strictly so named, considered Jesus as simply a man, a reformer, highly to be honored, of Judaism, by whom the Old Testament law had been purified and improved, and the prophecies fulfilled. The Gentile-Christian party, on the other hand, beheld in him *a person clothed with divine power and dignity*, who, until into the fourth century, was mostly held to be subordinate to the Supreme God and Creator of the world, in opposition to which opinion, after further conflicts, the conviction gained the ascendency that Jesus was in all respects equal to the Supreme God and Creator; that he was, in fact, the Supreme God himself, and that his actual humanity was no obstacle to his uniting in himself all the attributes of the Godhead.

Until into the seventh century, the conquered Jewish-Christian party exerted its utmost strength at least to prevent the admission of the full equality of the person of Christ with the one Supreme God. In vain.

The doctrine of the unconditional divinity of Jesus Christ was erected into an inviolable law of the State, and, in the Church dogma of the Trinity, was irresistibly established with all the supports of what appeared to be learning. Even the men of the Reformation did not venture to attack the foundations thus laid of the Church doctrine; illogical as it was to build a new edifice upon an old basis which had come, in the course of time, to be crumbling away.

That through the representation of the person of Jesus, which, by means of the Christian State-Church, became legally established, and which was received into Protestant confessions of faith as self-evident and needing no improvement, there runs an essential contradiction, will not now be denied by any candid inquirer. It is essential, above all things, to the idea of a person, that he is in his inmost self a unit; only upon this supposition can he be historically considered. This unity is by the popular doctrine destroyed in the person of the Redeemer of the world. In the Church creeds Jesus Christ is represented as a double being, as the personal union of two existences, which in themselves have nothing in common, which indeed absolutely contradict each other, and, only by means of a miracle transcending all our ideas, can be brought into close and inseparable connection. According to these creeds, *he is man and God in one and the same person.* The Church theologians have made great exertions to represent as intelligible and possible this inseparable union of God and man in one person. But they have always been forced at last to confess that it is inconceivable, and that an impenetrable mystery wraps the personality of Jesus Christ. In a case, however, in which the point aimed at is the elucidation of

an historical fact, an appeal to mystery and miracle is, for the purposes of knowledge, utterly worthless. It reveals to us the incapacity of theology to make consistent what is self-contradictory, or to render intelligible what is historically incomprehensible.

That Jesus once lived as "true God and true man" among men, and is still living, as such, present above, is a proposition that demands the gravest consideration. How can a person, possessing the illimitable attributes of God, and able to reveal himself every moment, be at the same time subject to those limitations which belong to the peculiar nature of man? Man as such is not all-powerful, on the contrary his power is very limited; he is not all-knowing, with his highest spiritual endowments and his utmost efforts, in comparison with the sum of things to be known he knows very little; he is not everywhere present, he is able at any one time to be present at only a single point of space. Granting that Jesus Christ was, and still is, all-powerful, all-knowing, and all-present, then it follows that with no right are the attributes of a man, in the full and true sense of the word, ascribed to him. In no way in fact can the popular doctrine give any meaning to the proposition that Jesus Christ, as a person invested with all the attributes of the divine nature, lived a really finite and limited human life, subject to pain, sickness, and death. Statements like these, namely, that he imposed limitations on himself in regard to his divine fulness; that, during his earthly life, he made no use, or only a partial use, of his divine powers, are not only empty and unmeaning subterfuges, they are derogatory to the perfections and majesty of God. A God who limits himself, is a God who ceases to be God, for to the being of God, it be-

longs above all things to be unlimited. By propositions of this sort, Christian theology sinks to the level of heathen representations of God. It makes Him a being changeable and divisible, that is, a mere personification of forces and powers. A point of view, whence God is thus regarded, is already fundamentally surrendered. It has nothing to rely upon for its self-justification.

2. All this may well have great significance for theological science, but is it equally important to the life of the Church what views are entertained of the person of Jesus Christ? We cannot, it seems to us, ascribe too high an importance to the influence which the doctrine concerning the person of Christ has in this quarter. It is a fact not to be questioned, that as this doctrine has taken form, so has the Church been shaped, and that, in the same measure in which this doctrine has deviated from the truth, the life of the Church has assumed a form in direct opposition to the primitive ideas of Christ. If the person of Christ be indeed of so wonderful a nature as the theology of the Church has settled it to be, and if it be so entirely unintelligible how such a person could have lived an historical existence, and can still exist in a glorified state beyond the grave, then must it be a specially great merit in a man so completely to renounce his understanding, that he holds himself convinced of this miraculous and incomprehensible thing, or rather, that he has *faith* in it without being convinced. What the established Church doctrine calls *Faith*, stands in the closest connection with the Church representation, described above, of the person of Christ. Within the strict sphere of the Church, and from the point of view of its theology, it has always been accounted the first

condition of genuine Christian piety, to accept, in regard to the person of Christ, the thoroughly contradictory for possible, and the most unintelligible for actual truth. Thus have reason and the understanding been disconnected from Christianity, and piety has been put in opposition to intellectual growth and to the culture and progress of nations.

What in itself is true has in this way become a caricature. True it is that piety is an immediate relation of the human spirit to the Infinite and Eternal; true it is also that the Eternal and Divine, as such, is incomprehensible; and that man in the central soul of him is altogether dependent upon God. But when the thinking faculty begins to act upon the nature and experiences of piety, then it is no more an immediate and original relation to the Infinite and the Eternal with which we are concerned, but then we are occupied with the finite agency of reason which creates ideas, and with the reflective work of the understanding. And therefore, it is unreasonable to impose silence upon reason and the understanding in the sphere in which alone they have authority. Every doctrine of the Church is a result of the action of reason and the understanding. The reason and understanding of churchmen and theologians have given existence to the doctrines of the Church concerning the person of Christ. How then can reason and the understanding be forbidden to examine the grounds, in reason and in history, of the dogmas which they themselves have brought into existence, and possibly, by a false or insufficient use of their powers? How can it be required of them that they should render unconditional homage to their own perhaps very defective work, and bow blindly before it as before an infallible revelation from

God? And yet the Church doctrine of the person of the Saviour could be maintained only upon the condition that reason and the understanding were reduced to silence; and a blind faith in the doctrine was demanded, and even, at times, according to circumstances, compelled. The consequence was, that a double kind of truth came to be recognized: truths of reason in the department of secular science, and truths of faith in the department of theology. In the former, one was an inquirer; in the latter, a blind submission was practised, especially so long as the slightest opposition to the reigning doctrine was punished with fire and sword. One wonders that the Catholic structure of doctrine has stood so long unshaken. The history of heresy in the middle ages solves the enigma. By the reckless use of power, by a system of unheard of cruelty and oppression, it is possible to perpetuate any error.

After the doctrine concerning the person of Christ had once effected a separation of knowledge from faith, of reason from piety, and of secular wisdom from Church dogmas, it was but an inevitable further consequence, that the schism should gradually extend to all the relations of life, dividing the Church from the State, the clergy from the laity, the laity from the theologians; cause the spiritual to take precedence of the secular, monastic life to be esteemed holier than married life, and the papal power to be honored above the imperial. As the divinity in the person of Christ was infinitely above his human nature, so the Church truths of faith were infinitely more important than the truths of reason. Things temporal, civil, and political, seemed, in and by themselves, worthless and insignificant; they were, as such, without enduring import. They could gain real worth, and substantial claims to consideration,

only through their connection with the divine, and, to effect this connection, those who had in their keeping the doctrines of faith and the Church, and the treasures of divine grace, the priests, were indispensable, — the priests, who, out of the fulness of heavenly blessings, exclusively intrusted to them, dispensed the Church's means of grace only upon condition that they were received with *faith*, that is, with a complete resignation of all claims to think and decide for one's self. The decisive rupture of the Church with the demands of reason, and the results of scientific inquiry, and the progress of intellectual culture, found its most pointed expression in the doctrine of the *Mass*, or the continued bodily sacrifice of Christ through the priesthood for the expiation of the sins of the people. In this doctrine, the lay-understanding was required to accept the "faith," that a substance changed its nature without change of its properties, and the requisition was acquiesced in after a refusal had drawn down upon those who ventured it the most fearful consequences. The Church, having gained the advantage on this point over the understanding of the laity, could dare all things against the laity; a consciousness of boundless power soon drove it up to the dizziest height of self-exaltation.

3. The Reformers, as has already been observed, did not venture to subject the traditional doctrine concerning the person of Christ to a searching examination; yet the central principle of the Reformation was bound, in the course of time, to lead to a radical renovation of the doctrine. Roman Catholicism had reduced the laity, in the sphere of piety, to a perfectly passive state; it had, at the same time, taken away from the individual the burden of personal responsibility; for in all care and labor for the salvation of the

soul, the Church had usurped the place of the laity. Catholic piety thus became an affair of the Church. The Catholic faith is a self-renunciation of the individual in favor of the Church. Protestantism, on the contrary, in this same department of piety, recognized the rights of conscience, and the freedom of conscience among the laity. According to its fundamental principles, every Christian is to take care of his own salvation upon his personal responsibility. All concern and labor for the Church is handed over to the body of believers, and of course to every member of it. Protestant piety is therefore essentially moral; the Protestant faith aims at the personally moral and religious culture of the individual in his immediate relations to God.

Roman Catholicism, as it is essentially ecclesiastical, rests therefore as essentially upon tradition. It is welded to traditionary doctrines and observances as with iron. Should it leave its traditions, it would forsake its very foundation. The hope that it will ever reform itself is, therefore, an idle dream. The hour of its reform would be the hour of its self-destruction.

Protestantism, because it is essentially moral in its nature, rests upon *free inquiry*. It has no interest in clinging at all costs to traditionary and established forms; it has, rather, exerted its utmost strength to tear itself away from the doctrines and forms of the past. It is not the religion of ecclesiastical or political interests, but the religion that meets the moral and eternal needs of man, the religion of the conscience, of reason quickened by the conscience, and of the will sanctified by enlightened reason. It ceases, therefore, to rest on usages that have come to serve the selfish and self-seeking; it is prompted to knock at the gates

of truth, until the ultimate causes and powers are reached, by which the moral and religious development of man is conditioned and accomplished.

In receiving into its confessions and formulas, without investigation, the Catholic doctrine of the middle ages, in regard to the person of Christ, Protestantism adopted a Roman Catholic proceeding. From the dread of consequences, it failed to make use of its own principles in relation to the doctrine. But the punishment of a practical violation of principle is scarcely ever long delayed. Upon the doctrine respecting the person of Christ, as we have already remarked, has essentially depended the Christian doctrine of faith. As the Reformers suffered the self-contradictory doctrine of the Roman Catholic Church concerning Christ to remain, it followed of necessity that they were obliged to leave the doctrine in a form that forbade all investigation into the nature of faith. In fact, the Protestant confessions, especially the Lutheran, do, for the most part, demand a faith that abjures all freedom of thought, discourages all participation of reason in the formation of Church doctrines, and yields submission to the traditional ideas of grace and reprobation. Here is, substantially, again, only the Catholic notion of faith; it is wanting in the vital moral nerve, in the edge of conscience, in the inextinguishable charm found in the search for truth. Protestantism was thus false to its origin, to its destiny, to its moving impulse. It forgot that the doctrines received from the Catholic Church were likewise the results of the activity of reason and the understanding. While it gloried in having broken with human authority, as it certainly had done, it persisted, without scruple, in upholding the old formulas, even with extreme violence, and kept the

minds of men relentlessly in the chains of an obsolete letter.

It has been for a long time the custom to treat Rationalism, so called, with a certain contempt, and yet Rationalism is only a necessary step, which Protestantism, now in contradiction with itself, had to take on its way to self-consistency and self-liberation, and only in consequence of this step has Protestantism decisively released itself from its traditional connections with Roman Catholicism. The key to the understanding of Rationalism is found in the traditional doctrine concerning the person of Christ. It has not, indeed, untied the knot with care, it has severed it with rather an awkward sword-cut. At the same time, for the renovation of the doctrine, it has rendered service permanent and indisputable. It has brought back to a simple representation the contradictory double being to which the traditional doctrine of the Church has attached the name of Christ; it has sought to apprehend the person of Christ *humanly*. It is true, neither religiously nor historically has it been true to the elevation and originality of the character of Jesus. Christianity is a religion; Rationalism an idea of the schools. Roman Catholicism formed its idea of Christ in accordance with its ecclesiastical interests. Rationalism represents him in accordance with philosophical hypotheses, which, it is not to be denied, are very meagre and unsatisfactory. The rationalistic representation of Christ, not only leaves our sensibilities untouched, the imagination empty, and the heart indifferent, it fails also to make it clear to the understanding how this wise Rabbi of Nazareth, this enlightened Jew, who, for his devotion to the enlightenment of the world, was by priestly hatred and official jealousy put to death on

the cross, succeeded in establishing a religion for the world, and in turning for centuries the collected streams of human culture into a determinate channel. According to the principles of the Rationalistic theology, one would have looked for the founding of an order of "illuminati" rather than a Church of Christ for the world. It is quite impossible to *believe* in the Christ of the Rationalists. His person is made sufficiently transparent and intelligible, but the effect which he has produced is not accounted for. Rationalism lacks what is wanted in his person, in order to understand this effect: an original communion with the Divine, the Infinite; the Divine does not appear as present in him. It is only a divinity outside and above the world that Rationalism recognizes; and, therefore, there is no new revelation introduced with Christ, no new creative centre in the world's history. As, from the rationalistic point of view, Christ is only the merely human bringer of a new degree of knowledge, religious and moral, there is wanting to him, in this school, not only the idea of the Church, but still more, the fact of a Communion. The pulpit becomes the professor's chair, the Communion the auditory.

4. But Rationalism has forever undermined the traditional and self-contradictory doctrine concerning the person of Christ; it has brought the Saviour humanly nearer to men; it has awakened a want which can find its true content only in a personal and moral communion with Christ. An important step beyond Rationalism has been taken by Schleiermacher. The idea which this great theologian gives us of Christ meets the want of the human heart, which yearns inappeasably to live in immediate communion with God, and to be assured of the eternal and the holy in its own con-

sciousness. In the person of Christ, according to Schleiermacher, the eternal and the holy is humanly present to man; communion with Christ is communion with the Divine life itself. By Schleiermacher, the crude metal of the old doctrine of the Church is melted again into the warm flow of modern devout feeling; the external cover of the miraculous falls away as dross in the fire, and the moral form of the Saviour comes forth as refined gold. The idea of Christ as the moral ideal of the human heart is the central point of Schleiermacher's theology. One of the most beneficent consequences of it was, that it restored a moral worth to faith as a voluntary surrender of the heart to the holy idea actualized in the person of Christ.

Although the doctrine of Schleiermacher broke a path for us from this point, it has not sufficed to satisfy the Christian consciousness of our times in its deepest wants. In the objection so often made to Schleiermacher, that his idea of Christ owes its origin to the peculiar wants of an individual, there is considerable truth. Schleiermacher was too much under the influence of the philosophy of his day to succeed in the attempt, or even to be able to make it, to produce an authentic historical portrait of the Saviour. It was not the simple impulse towards the truth, the unmixed longing to see the Saviour precisely as he had actually presented himself to the world, that chiefly swayed Schleiermacher in his representation of Christ. His idea of a Christ was formed in accordance with his own religious needs. Only one who sympathized with those wants could fully accept his idea. This personal origin of his idea is the reason why only a theological school, and this against his will, has resulted from the teaching of Schleiermacher, and why he was unable to

call into existence the Church for the people, to which the times so earnestly point. His mind lacked a purely historical quality, and freedom from philosophical theories. The Christ of Schleiermacher is rather the artistic creation of the noblest and purest religious sensibility of the times, than a representation, gathered from the Gospels, of Jesus of Nazareth, as he went about and taught and labored among the people, and as, for the people, he suffered and died.

For the same reason also, the school of Schleiermacher was no match for the assaults made by D. F. Strauss, in his "Life of Jesus," upon all the representations that, up to that time, had been given of Christ. While the smaller and more logical portion of Schleiermacher's followers approximated the stand-point of the Tübingen critic, by far the larger part, seized with terror, showed themselves ready for the largest admissions against the obsolete ideas of the old Church, at the same time with many a protest against the spirit of modern times. Undoubtedly this false accommodation, being without any firm, intellectual basis, and without the power and logic of the old Church faith, which, from its exclusiveness, always possesses some power of resistance, only served to accelerate the destruction of the old idea. Since, in the work of D. F. Strauss, the image of Christ, handed down by the Gospels, disappears in a motley series of half-undesigned fancies, the fictions of the common consciousness of the primitive Christian age, there is no higher task for Christian wisdom than to gather from the written records on hand, instead of this pre-eminently negative and consequently unsatisfactory result, a real idea of Christ, faithful to the original, and of genuine historical truth. This task is closely connected with the questions of the time

now awaiting solution. For the great want of the Church is, above all things, that the collective life of the masses should be penetrated thoroughly and anew with the moral and spiritual influences of Christianity. The traditional forms and formulas, in which the Christian community has been wont for centuries to express its religious consciousness, are more or less worn out; but there still lies at the foundation of the same a theory in regard to the person of Christ which carries a contradiction in itself, and has hindered all free, personal appropriation of him. The vague terror of the supernatural, as it has been engendered and propagated by the dogmas and institutions of the Church of the middle ages, the slavish fear of the civil law that protected the power of the Church, the hope of reward hereafter, and the dread of future torment, — these traditional supports of Christianity have done their work, and are mouldering away. Faith in the Saviour of the world must rest on firmer grounds than those of superstition, priestcraft, and an imagination filled with happy or terrible visions. Confidence and love, and a free-will devotion of the heart must become the props and pillars on which that faith shall in future rest. It must find its support in *universal conviction*, in the moral and spiritual wants of mankind, in the educating influences of the time; and, by its means, human culture will be consecrated, and civilization will become thorough.

But, on these very accounts, faith in the highest and holiest ideas of the Christian mind must not prove an obstacle to the performance of the historical task before us. Far from impeding the rich development of human faculties and gifts, far from suppressing the fulness of power indwelling in the popular heart, faith in

Christ must rather become the highest and noblest quickener, by which all that is truly great in man, all that is useful in the State, all that is cultivated in society, all that is good and beautiful in daily life, shall be made to bear their full fruit.

5. That we shall ever have a "Life of Jesus," in the full meaning of the word, there is no reason to expect. We do not need it; it will be enough if we possess a true portraiture of the character of the Saviour. In the ecclesiastical doctrines concerning his person there is really nothing of the kind. How can any strictly historical lineaments be visible in a personality that never actually had a beginning, was never gradually developed, never really passed through the conflict with temptation, but from the first was essentially what it was at the last? The Christ of the Church is, in and by himself, unchangeable; and therefore does not possess the deep interest awakened by individual growth, and the unfolding of personal character. Even the trials that befall this Christ, the opposition with which he meets, the crushing fate to which he finally yields, — what meaning is there in all this, in connection with the majesty of the Godhead, impassible to suffering and pain, exalted infinitely above mortality and death, and, only of his own free-will, withholding the thunderbolts of his omnipotence, wherewith he can, at any moment, annihilate the adversary? Since the appearance of D. F. Strauss's "Life of Jesus," much has undoubtedly been done towards the production of an idea of Jesus fashioned in harmony with the primitive records. If the public faith of the church has not yet shown any improvement, it is because, with the exception of *Hase*, *Ewald*, *Baumgarten*, and *Keim*,* they

* The latest attempt, *E. Renan's*, to represent the life of Jesus (Vie

who have attempted to represent Jesus have furnished only very imperfect contributions. But, after the valuable labors of the theologians above mentioned, much yet remains to be done. We confront here, it is true, a work so difficult and so inexhaustible, that we can never hope to execute it perfectly. For, from within the narrowest historical limits, and with the scantiest sources of information, there is to be described, in the worthiest manner possible, the phenomenon unquestionably the most exalted and the richest in consequences in the history of the world. That here, at last, there will still remain much that we cannot know; that unknown influences worked together in the life of Jesus, forces which no human sagacity will ever succeed in estimating, there can be no doubt. But there is imposed upon the mind of man the task to apprehend in some measure the Greatest. God himself is the object and aim of its inquiries. Though divine truth is infinite, yet its destiny is to serve in a finite world. Only let the mind guard itself against the illusion that the representation of a fact is the fact itself, that the finite reflection of eternal truth, mirrored in the mind, is the very sun of truth. The work, which we have here undertaken, is not to write the "Life of Jesus," our aim goes no farther than to present a portrait of the character of Jesus, so far as this is possible, in accordance with authentic records. How Jesus became what he was; under what conditions, through what struggles and conflicts, his character was unfolded and brought to completion; what he willed, strove for, and accomplished, and in what special ways; wherein was

de Jésus, Paris, 1863), repeats, in many respects, the faults of the rationalistic period. Consult the Allgemeine Kirchliche Zeitschrift, 1863, No. 10, p. 620.

visible the impress and effect of the distinctive peculiarity of his living and striving, of his person and his work, — to show this to the best of our power is what we have here attempted. In this attempt, it is not merely a task of the intellect that we have had always before us, but also a want of the soul. We are deeply penetrated with the conviction that the comprehensive and thorough renovation of the Church, which our whole age is laboring to achieve, can only be accomplished in harmony with a renovated faith in the true, historical Christ, the Christ living in the history of the world.

CHAPTER II.

THE GOSPEL AUTHORITIES.

The extraordinary difficulty of an attempt like the present arises especially from the character of the sources whence the representation of the person of Jesus is to be drawn. We refer to the four canonical Gospels; the other writings to be used with these, such as the Apocrypha and Pseud-epigraphs of the Old and New Testaments, the works of Philo, Josephus, the Talmud, etc., are scarcely to be named with the Gospels.

In relation to the four Gospels, there stand directly opposed, the one to the other, two mutually repugnant views. The first is the narrow view, adopted by the Church, which assumes the Gospels to be entirely authentic, and, in respect to their historical credibility, elevated above all doubt. This assumption presupposes that the authors of the Gospels, like the authors

of the other sacred writings, were preserved, in the composition of their works, from all error by an influence of the Holy Spirit altogether supernatural. This mode of regarding the Gospels requires it to be shown that not the slightest mistake, error or contradiction is to be found in them. If the least error can be charged to them, the supposition of their infallibility falls at once to the ground. The subterfuge that the Holy Spirit may be allowed to err on unimportant points, and that it is enough if no great error occur, is as unfortunate as it is unworthy. It forgets that, if error is conceded on one point, it is possible everywhere, and that whoever is not true in little things, has no right to expect credit in great.

The other view, in direct opposition to the foregoing, is the rationally broad view, according to which the Gospels are the real productions of their authors and their times. It seeks to understand them from a consideration of the characters of their authors and their contents, of their literary structure, of their probable design, and of the views with which they may be supposed to have been composed. It studies the credibility, the genuineness, the probability, and the internal consistency of their statements; it compares them, so far as possible, with other contemporaneous accounts, as well as with each other. By the most thorough examination, it decides for itself upon the greater or less literary and historical value of one or the other of these accounts.

Nothing is clearer than that these two modes of viewing the Gospels cannot be held together. He who undertakes to describe Jesus must accept one or the other. In fact, whoever addresses himself to this undertaking has already decided between them, for

the accomplishment of the work is possible only upon the condition that we possess in the Gospels real historical authorities, which are to be examined, tested, compared with one another, and estimated according to their historical worth, and out of which the image to be fashioned must be formed only after thorough, searching, and comprehensive labor. Were the Gospels supernatural revelations coming directly from heaven, we should count it criminal to change only so much as a syllable.

That this rationally broad view of the original records is attended, for one who would portray the character of Jesus, with no slight difficulties is certainly not to be disputed. Even this free method of inquiry into the historical value and literary credibility of the Gospels, has led to essentially different results. Indeed there have not been wanting inquirers, who have denied the Gospels nearly all credibility. If we sympathized with this conclusion, our attempt to portray the person of Jesus would be labor lost.

But that any such uncertainty attaches to these records we are by no means persuaded. Like all original accounts of facts which have excited the vehement partisan sympathies of a small company of contemporaries, and created violent factions, the Gospels have taken different personal colorings; their statements are of unequal historical value, accordingly as they are more or less removed from the facts narrated. But their different coloring points only the more impressively to the strong light and life that streamed forth from Him whose acts they relate; and while the unequal historical worth of these narrations may well call for the keenest investigation, it proves that these accounts are independent one of another. Yes, and even if fabu-

lous elements have become mixed with them, these fables bear historical witness to the extraordinary depth of the impression which the personality of Jesus made upon all those who were brought into more or less intimate communication with him.

2. There is not now extant any record which was made during the life of Jesus. The things that befell him, the things that he did, were, at the first, told and circulated in the little circle of his disciples and friends, only orally. (*a*) In the first three Gospels are preserved the first written accounts of him, more or less circuitously transmitted. But even here his figure is not drawn by the hand of any Apostle, for that the Greek Gospel of Matthew in our New Testament, in its present form, is not the work of the apostle of that name, is the certain conclusion of recent learned investigations.[1] The relation of the first three Gospels to one another is a point of peculiar difficulty. Their relationship is best explained by the supposition that an older document, a so-styled original gospel, is the basis of all three. The oldest Gospel, it seems in the highest degree probable, was composed by Mark as the "Gospel of Jesus Christ,"[2] before the year 60 of our reckoning, in the Church at Rome, to meet the wants of the Western missions. By a later hand, to which we owe our Gospel of Mark in its present form, additions have been made, and greater order has been introduced in the whole. Hence, we have a clearer image of Jesus reflected in this Gospel than in the two others. Not only are its narrations more vivid, the fabulous

[1] Consult on this point, e. g. *B. Bleek,* Einleitung in das Neue Testament, pp. 5, 94, 285.

[2] So was the Gospel of Mark originally entitled. The recently discovered Codex Sinaïticus preserves this title.

element in the introduction, the different appearances of Jesus after his resurrection, and the ascension, (*b*) are wanting in it altogether. If, as has been supposed up to this day, according to the theory of Griesbach, Mark were a mere transcriber, without purpose, of the first and third Gospels, the above omissions would be all the more difficult to be accounted for, as experience teaches that, the further a narrator is from the scene of the events narrated, the more liable is he to such mythical exaggerations. Even of any so-called tendency in that direction, there is in Mark no trace. That the Messianic era had begun with Jesus Christ, that the kingdom of God had come, that repentance and faith in Christ were the conditions of entrance into the kingdom, — these things Mark seeks to show in his Gospel by simple matters of fact.[1]

But the first Evangelist shows unmistakably a literary purpose. In order to produce faith in the Messianic dignity of Jesus, a simple collection of his works and experiences by no means satisfies Matthew. He aims, and in fact with pointed reference to the unbelieving Jews, to adduce proofs, from the writings of the Old Covenant especially, that Jesus was the Christ, that is, the Messiah promised in the law and the prophets, and he makes use even of the extremely doubtful genealogies[2] as evidence of the descent of Jesus from David. Just for the very reason that the scene of the events narrated is more remote from the field of his vision, he delights to go back to the sacred writings of the Jews themselves, and endeavor, although not always fortunately, to show that Jesus suffered and wrought

[1] See Holzmann, Die synoptischen Evangelien, ihr Ursprung und geschichtlicher Charakter, pp. 67–113.

[2] Matt. i. 1–17.

just so, and not otherwise, because an Old Testament passage had to be fulfilled in his person.[1] The fortunes and acts of the Saviour are thus made to present a character not altogether free; they do not appear to have grown out of his individual self-consciousness; they cease to be the natural consequences of his own personal self-determination; they evolve themselves rather, to their minutest particulars, as parts of a preconceived scheme, so that, for example, even the foal[2] upon which Jesus rode into Jerusalem, and the potter's field which the high council are said to have purchased with the blood-money of the traitor,[3] were, according to a text in the Old Testament, pre-ordained, and had to serve the fulfilment of events historically arranged to secure the work of redemption. Hence, in the first Gospel, in a much fuller sense than in the second, the whole life of Jesus is viewed as fulfilling a decreed, historical scheme of salvation; he suffers his fate, rather than accomplishes it; even, indeed, in breaking with the Old Covenant, and in calling a new dispensation into existence, according to the first Gospel his whole working and striving were ordained so to proceed, that not a tittle of the old law should pass away.[4] The streams flow for us far more richly in the first Gospel than in the second. It is not satisfied with a simple statement of facts, it weaves into the story longer discourses, the most comprehensive of which, the Sermon on the Mount, so called, points to an earlier collection of the sayings of Jesus, used by the author of the first Gospel. Still richer materials than those which the

[1] Matt. ii. 5, 15, 18; iii. 3; iv. 15; viii. 17; ix. 13; xi. 10; xii. 17; xiii. 14, 35; xv. 7; xxi. 5, 13, 16, 42; xxvi. 31; xxvii. 9.

[2] Matt. xxi. 4.

[3] Matt. xxvii. 9.

[4] Matt. v. 18.

first two Gospels used, the third Evangelist[1] had at his command, some of them betraying, even more distinctly, the increase of the fabulous element. In one important respect, however, the first three Gospels entirely agree. According to all three, the first period of the public life of Jesus was spent in Galilee, and only towards the end, before the final catastrophe, did he journey through Samaria to Jerusalem, where he uttered his great thoughts with increased boldness and decision, but where his enemies closed round him more fiercely, and prepared a violent end to his career. Of an earlier appearance in Jerusalem or Judea, the first three Gospels show no knowledge. The first and third have, indeed, preserved for us a passage[2] in which Jesus laments his frequent and fruitless attempts to gather around him the children of Jerusalem. This passage has commonly been understood to point to his earlier presence in Judea. We must suppose the last visit — according to the first three Evangelists the only one — to have been, in all probability, of longer duration.[3] During the last sojourn at Jerusalem, Jesus not only taught oftener in the temple, he visited the surrounding country;[4] moreover time was needed for his opponents, at first undecided how they should proceed against him, to mature their plans. A considerable space of time spent in Jerusalem and its neighborhood towards the end of his career, is indicated by his emphatic denunciations of the Scribes and Pharisees,[5] in which, as in the Sermon on the Mount, we have a series of assaults upon those incorrigible theocrats,

[1] Luke i. 1–4.
[2] Matt. xxiii. 37; Luke xiii. 34.
[3] Matt. xix. 1; Mark x. 1; Luke ix. 51.
[4] Luke x. 38.
[5] Matt. xxiii. 1; Luke xi. 37.

which require a period of some length to be assigned to his abode in Judea. The order of events certainly is not observed with any care in the first three Gospels. Still, in general, a certain degree of order is plainly visible.[1]

We are now in a position, under the lead of the first three Gospels, to trace the gradual formation of the Messianic self-consciousness of Jesus. We are enabled with their help to see that upon his first public appearance he was not perfectly clear as to his mission as the Deliverer; that, at that time, he neither declared himself the "Messiah," nor demanded recognition as such; that, only from his own inner experiences and through outward events did light break fully for him upon his high calling. We gather also from the first three Gospels, that at the first he did not attempt to extend his labors beyond the boundaries of Israel; that he needed further light and experience before he could stand firmly in the conviction of his being called as the destined Saviour of all mankind. We learn from these three Gospels how rapidly grew his influence among the people; how his power of healing, which he used without any thought of himself, won for him the confidence of the suffering many in ever increasing measure; how, on the other hand, he became separated from his own immediate kindred, who would fain have treated him as a madman. A flood of sufferings, struggles and trials, broke over his soul before he uttered the decisive word that he was the Messiah.

3. Through these storms — according to the first three Gospels — his self-consciousness was wrought out

[1] In regard to the first three Gospels, and their credibility as the sources of the Evangelical history, see Appendix, Ill. 1, p. 25.

into full clearness. To his pure will, in which with the greatest strength was united a consummate wisdom, the heaviest task of all was to put himself in determined opposition to the institutions handed down from the fathers, the moral claims of which he always recognized.

This position he reached only when he had come to see clearly how impossible it was through them to accomplish a moral and religious renovation of his country and of mankind. That eternal salvation was not to be effected by a traditional and legal correctness of life was the central light and life of his teachings and consolations. A consciousness of God, infinitely higher and deeper than that of the prophets, flamed up in his soul, and to this, according to the first three Gospels, he gave such an expression as could be given to it only by one whose whole soul was concentrated upon winning eternal life.

Up to this point of time the Theocratic National party of his country, intellectually crushed down in the schools of the Pharisees, regarded him, we may suppose, with quite as much of hope as of apprehension. But the moment at last arrived when the leaders of this party would be bound to turn against him. It was not any longer the little circle of his immediate relatives, it was those who had in charge the political hopes of the people, the pioneers in the social struggles of the country, who now hoped nothing more from him, but on the contrary feared from his opposition to the traditions of the fathers the ruin of those plans which they had long secretly cherished. It was not as a mere madman that they regarded him. Judging from the extraordinary consequences of his words and works among all classes of the people, they looked

upon him as an instrument of the God-hating kingdom of Satan, as a destroyer of their sacred theocratic institutions, seeking to overthrow all order, human and divine. And when now in bold contempt of daily increasing opposition and in the clearest and most profound consciousness of his Messiahship, he ceased to forbid his disciples to publish the fact that he was the Promised One of Israel, then there could scarcely remain a doubt what the result of his life would be.

But the loftier the height of his consciousness, and the purer and brighter his public career, the darker is the shadow cast upon it, according to the first three Gospels, by one great enigma. We refer to the miracles which are related to us in his history. Not those miracles of healing which, at the first, bound the multitude to him, and caused him to appear as a physician to the sick and the suffering, — it is not in these that the essential difficulty of the enigma appears. They admit of being explained physiologically with increasing clearness, as the effects of a personality endowed with the richest spiritual powers and with the rarest moral force, and regarded by those needing help with an unbounded confidence. But the later miracles ascribed to Jesus are of an essentially different character. Here we no longer have to do with the removal of diseases, bodily and mental, by the influence of a powerful personality, but acts of Almighty power confront us. Nothing less than all the laws of Nature appear to be abrogated; not merely does a higher order of Nature and of the world come in, in place of the lower, but the action of Jesus is limited by no natural laws whatever. At a word from him the storm ceases. In his hand a few loaves and fishes are so multiplied as to furnish nourishment for hungry

thousands. At his command the life that has departed returns to the corpse. At his rebuke a tree is withered because it bears no fruit, at a season of the year too at which no fruit was to be expected.

In other respects in the first three Gospels Jesus appears throughout as a human being, living and moving within the limitations of human nature; but by his miraculous action, these limitations are broken through. Such miracles of Omnipotence are, humanly speaking, no longer intelligible.

On this account the question forces itself upon us irresistibly, whether such miracles actually took place, and especially whether they be in harmony with that idea of Jesus which we gather from the first three Gospels. That a life, like that of the Saviour, should, immediately upon its mortal ending, be invested with a rich coloring of fable, lies in the nature of the case. The stories of his nativity and the reports of his ascension confirm this idea. Thus it may be seen how possible it was that fable should gather even around the public career of Jesus, and this was the more possible, the more the popular imagination was impressed by what he actually did. The harder it became for the next succeeding generations to appreciate the spiritual greatness and the moral elevation of this singular personality, the more easily may we understand how they yielded to the temptation to make his inward, personal greatness and dignity intelligible by visible wonders. Besides, the Old Testament exemplars suggested the idea that Jesus must not be left behind these. As Moses had drawn water from a rock to refresh the thirsty and had fed the hungry with manna, as Elijah and Elisha had healed the sick and raised the dead, how incumbent did it become to ascribe greater and more

glorious deeds to one who was unquestionably greater than Moses, and nobler than Elijah. It is no device of writers aiming to establish a point, still less, as from a low historical point of view it may be thought, is it falsehood and deceit that we have here. In these extraordinary accounts we have the unconscious homage of a religiously inspired imagination paid to Jesus by disciples and friends, touched to the inmost and seeking by such hyperboles to give expression, inadequate indeed when measured by sober, historical criticism, to the sacred glow of admiration, love, and reverence with which they regarded the majestic idea of him by whom they had been refreshed with living water, fed with the bread of Heaven, and awakened to an undying life. (*c*)

By placing himself in full opposition to the theocracy, in declaring that, as the Messiah, he would destroy the theocratic structure, and establish a kingdom of truth, righteousness, peace, freedom, and love, a spiritual kingdom of God, the final crisis was brought immediately near. All temptations to a violent insurrection against the established order he had repelled. All cunningly devised plots he had thrust aside. He had not suffered himself to be involved in any conflict with the Roman power, with the Jewish laws of marriage, or with the civil courts. From any mingling with the political questions of the day he had always kept himself aloof. Nevertheless it could not be that his enemies, inflamed by hatred, in full possession of power, and provided with all the means of persecution, would fail to find opportunities, under the show of a legal proceeding, to accomplish his destruction. His invisible kingdom, based upon mental freedom, was certainly not to be reconciled with the tradi-

tional idea of the hierarchical constitution, with the temple service, with sacrificial and sabbatical observances; especially was it at variance with the aims of the national party. He could even less look for the support of the Romans in the moral and religious reform at which he aimed, as they were wont to effect their reforms with the sword, and in the present case they could have no inclination to draw upon themselves the deadly hatred of the most powerful party among the Jews. That his teaching should give great offence was inevitable. The explicitness with which he declared himself the Messenger and the Son of God could easily be regarded from the strictly monotheistic stand-point as a dishonor done to God, as downright blasphemy. When his final proceedings in Jerusalem had rendered the rupture with the theocratic party complete, what conflicts were there still before him: the conflict with his own disciples, who at heart shared in the hopes of the theocrats, and only with the greatest difficulty could liberate themselves from the expectation of a political Messiah; the conflict with his own countrymen, who were under the same error, longing for a Christ in the interest of a theocracy that should rule the world; the conflict with his own flesh and blood, which in the fulness of life and natural vigor reluctd at the pain and torture of an untimely and violent death; the conflict with treachery in his own little circle, which he saw but could not expose! And so is presented the spectacle that touches the heart forever, of all that innocent suffering, through which, looked upon and condemned as a criminal, he is transfigured into a heavenly conquerer, and out of which, perishing in death, he comes forth living forever.

As the foregoing hints intimate, the first three Gospels place before us a portrait of Jesus, which with the exception of the miracles is perfectly intelligible in itself, and in the highest meaning of the words impressive and elevating.

4. But now a fourth Gospel completes the circle of the Evangelical histories, and in this Gospel we meet, to our surprise, with an essentially differently colored picture of the Saviour.[1] In the first three Gospels, the sphere of the activity of Jesus is wholly Galilean; but in this Gospel, on the contrary, we find him alternating between Galilee and Judea. He journeys frequently with his disciples from Galilee to Jerusalem, and back again, and in the capital, at the very first, he comes into violent collision with the theocratic party.[2] Of a gradual development of his religious and Messianic self-consciousness, of a perceptible growth of his inner life, there is here no trace. He is already, at the first, what he continues to be to the end. From the beginning he reveals his indwelling divine glory; from the beginning his disciples believe in him with full faith; from the beginning he declares that he is to put an end to the temple service. At the very first meeting with Peter, Peter addresses him as the Messiah, as the Son of God; Nathaniel, also, proclaims him king of the Jews.[3]

How different from all this, the first three Gospels! What in the fourth Gospel is related to have occurred at once, suddenly, without any preliminary steps, in the other Gospels comes to its completion gradually. According to these Jesus begins, not with miracles of Al-

[1] In regard to the peculiar character of the fourth Gospel, see Appendix, Ill. 2, p. 31.

[2] John ii. 13.

[3] John i. 49.

mighty power,* but with acts that quiet rather than excite, namely, with the healing of the "possessed" so called, instances of which, singularly enough, are never once mentioned in the fourth Gospel. That the representation of Jesus in the first three Gospels does not agree with that in the fourth Gospel, must be conceded in the present advanced state of knowledge by every candid inquirer. We at once perceive the difference, in part through the sharply distinctive character of the fourth Gospel. The first three Gospels all show more or less distinctly a simple purpose, namely, to give a narrative of the most important events of the Evangelical history. The first and third Evangelists, do not, however, disclaim the further purpose of creating faith in him who is the great subject of their histories. But, although Matthew and Luke do not write with entire historical singleness, they consider it their main task to tell what Jesus did, wrought, and suffered. Although in their prefatory chapters and in their accounts of separate miracles, they transgress the limits of the strict province of history, yet they present the unhistorical historically, and we find in their writings no background of speculative philosophical ideas. Quite otherwise is it, in this respect, with the fourth Gospel. This Gospel has an introduction[1] in which nothing is said of what Jesus did and suffered; but we are led back to things antecedent to his earthly life. It is not only as the Messiah, come forth from Israel, the most exalted descendant of the royal house of David, the heaven-chosen mediator of God's people, and consequently the redeemer of mankind, that he is represented, but rather as

* [How is this assertion to be reconciled with the account of the stilling of the waves, which occurs in Matt. viii. 24, etc? — TRANS.]

[1] John i. 1–14.

the personal revelation of the eternal God himself, immediately — and from eternity — proceeding from God, and manifesting the holy and everlasting life of God on the earth in the perishable and sinful flesh. It is the divine light shining from all eternity, which has broken into the darkness of the world, in order to illumine it. After such a statement as this in regard to the personality of Jesus, given in the beginning of the fourth Gospel, there could be described in this Gospel no development, no growth, no gradual progress towards the consciousness of his Messianic calling. The earthly appearance of Jesus, that which the fourth Gospel designates in him as the "Flesh," was only the covering which, as a thick veil, concealed the unapproachable light of his divinity. Thus was Jesus at the beginning of his career the same that he was at the conclusion, the vicegerent of the Heavenly Father, clothed with the attributes and powers of the Godhead itself, and all that he did was only an unbroken series of illuminations, beaming forth from his superhuman glory. Jesus is therefore described in the fourth Gospel, as all-knowing[1] and all-powerful. When it represents him otherwise, the reason is that even this Gospel is connected, in part, with Evangelical traditions, and follows historical documents.

Those theologians who, agreeing with the tradition of the Church, hold the apostle John to have been the author of the fourth Gospel, have an insurmountable difficulty to clear away. There is this fact to be explained, namely, that several important events related in the other Gospels have found no place in the fourth, such, for example, as the temptation, the transfigura-

[1] John i. 48; ii. 20; iv. 18; vi. 64.

tion, the healing of the possessed, the Last Supper, and the Sermon on the Mount. The popular explanation that the fourth Gospel is designed only to supply the deficiencies of the other three, not only proposes a very superficial stand-point for the author, but it is contradicted by the fact that this Gospel relates many things told in the other Gospels, as, for example, the purification of the temple, the healing in Capernaum, the miraculous feeding of the multitude, the walking of Jesus upon the sea, the anointing at Bethany, etc., while, on the other hand, the omissions in this Gospel find a most natural explanation in its fundamental propositions. The Saviour, as the personal and voluntary revelation of the Godhead made by itself in the flesh, could not be liable to temptation, and he whose celestial glory was poured forth from his interior being in word and deed like a continuous stream of light, needed no outward transfiguration. The omission of the institution of the Lord's Supper is explained by the circumstance that from his dogmatic point of view the Evangelist could attach thereto only a relatively slight importance in consistency with his declaration that faith in the Saviour is the true eating and drinking of his body and blood.[1]

That the Sermon on the Mount is wanting in the fourth Gospel, is due to the position which Jesus takes in this Gospel towards the Old Testament law.

According to the Sermon on the Mount, in the first Gospel — the sermon in the vale in the third — Jesus has certainly assigned a new place to the Old Testament law and spiritualized its contents, without, however, in any essential point abolishing it, or declaring it invalid. According to the fourth Gospel the Old Tes-

[1] John vi. 51.

tament Law is essentially different from the Gospel,[1] which is grace and truth. Even for this purpose, to destroy the Old Testament temple, did Jesus appear. Legal institutions are not for him to administer; he did not come into the world to judge the world.[2] Only from faith, not from works of the law, comes eternal life.[3] On this account the worship of God is no longer confined to the Old Testament temple, or to any sacred place; it is in spirit and in truth, needing not the help of ceremonies and symbols.[4] It is evident in the fourth Gospel, that Jesus breaks the Sabbath.[5] He tells the Jews that the Old Testament scripture testifies of him, but he hesitates not to say that it was one of their "opinions" that eternal life was to be found therein, for the letter kills, the spirit only gives life. Repeatedly in the fourth Gospel there appears a sharp opposition to Moses, of whom it is said without qualification that he did not give the people the true bread of Heaven.[6] So far is the external fulfilling of the law from securing salvation, that a special drawing by the Father, an immediate influence from heaven, is needed in order to come to the Son.[7] Therefore in the time of the old Covenant there was no Holy Ghost. That was granted to Christian believers, and not until after Christ was glorified.[8] In the fourth Gospel Jesus speaks of the Old Testament law as of something foreign that did not concern him; he refers to it as "your law," "their law."[9] He puts his teaching in unmistakable opposition to that law;[10] and only in his

[1] John i. 17.
[2] John iii. 17; xii. 47.
[3] John iii. 36.
[4] John iv. 23.
[5] John v. 18.
[6] John vi. 32.
[7] John vi. 44. [Misinterpretation. — Trans.]
[8] John vii. 39.
[9] John viii. 17; xv. 25.
[10] John viii. 31.

teaching — not, therefore, in the Law — is the truth. Even the renowned ancestor of the Jews, Abraham, is reduced in the fourth Gospel to a subordinate position, as when Jesus declares that he, the representative of eternal truth, was before Abraham.[1] The supporters of the Jewish theocracy are directly considered as the instruments of the devil, and the politico-theocratical kingdom which they had in view, as a kingdom of the devil.[2]

That Jesus designated all that had gone before him as thieves and robbers,[3] a designation that cannot possibly be understood as applying to his immediate opposers, also indicates the sharpest opposition of the fourth Gospel to the established Old Testament ideas. If Moses and the prophets are not here referred to, at all events the reference must be to the scribes, as they had established themselves in Israel after the second temple. Beyond all question, the fourth Gospel shows a fundamental difference between Christianity and Judaism, whence, throughout and without any circumlocution, the opposers of Jesus are always spoken of as "Jews." For the same reason Jesus gives in this Gospel a "new commandment,"[4] no longer a commandment inspiring fear by the threat of punishment, but a law of love. Of a continued respect for the Old Testament law we here find nothing. Only the relation towards Christ decides the condition of the heart toward God.[5] The commandments of Christ are to be kept, not the law of Moses. All that is outside of this relation to Christ is no more divine, but of "the world." The spirit of truth, as the spirit of Christ,

[1] John viii. 52 – 58.
[2] John viii. 42, etc.
[3] John x. 8.
[4] John xiii. 34.
[5] John xv. 1.

and no longer the law, is to guide and govern the Christian body.

In view of all this, is it not something more than "critical pride and the blindness of the time"[1] that suggests doubts as to whether a Gospel, showing peculiarities so hard to be explained historically, and such remarkable deviations from the older traditions, can have been written by a disciple and apostle of Jesus, an eye-witness and immediate voucher of the facts? The external evidences that John wrote the fourth Gospel are, it must be admitted, not so unsatisfactory as they who dispute John's authorship represent them. But it is nevertheless true that in the writings of Justin Martyr, that is, about the middle of the second century, there is not a single passage that can be said with certainty to be quoted from the fourth Gospel,— not even the supposed quotation from ch. iii. 3–5;[2] and that the Gospel was used by Basilides (about the years 125–130) is yet more doubtful. At all events, the apostolic origin of this Gospel cannot be fully established by any external evidences. The internal evidence will always be decisive. It certainly then is not easy to understand how an eye-witness, from whom the most authentic and exact reports were to be expected, could from the very beginning give up the historical basis entirely and plant himself upon a purely speculative stand-point. That the Apostle of the Jews, John, should begin his Gospel with a theory of the supernatural and pre-existent "Logos," and see in the human appearance and career of Jesus a special self-revelation of a divine personality come in the flesh,

[1] *Meyer*, crit. exeg., Handbuch über das Evang. des Joh., 4th ed. pref. VI.

[2] Apol. I. 61.

is, in itself, certainly not probable. We would not give too great weight to the fact that the tenor, keeping, and color of the fourth Gospel, are not in harmony with the character of the Apostle John as he is portrayed in the first three Gospels. The son of thunder,[1] ambitious of rank in the Messiah's kingdom,[2] and ready to call down fire from heaven upon the Samaritans,[3] certainly could not, except in consequence of a most extraordinary inward change, become an apostle with the world-embracing love of the author of the fourth Gospel; and although it is not wholly impossible yet it is very improbable that the author — as the Apostle John according to all grounds of probability internal and external must be held to be — of the Apocalypse, written as it is in the avenging spirit of a Jewish Christian, should at the same time have written this Gospel also, which breathes the tenderest and most unbounded love. That, moreover, the Apostle John during the later period of his residence in Jerusalem did not by any means occupy the ground of evangelical freedom, but showed himself still inclined to confine his labors to the Jews, is evident beyond question from the epistle to the Galatians.[4]

We attach, however, greater weight to the fact that in the fourth Gospel that part of the career of Jesus receives the least attention which in the other Gospels gives us the deepest impression of historical credibility. How can the eye-witness John, the intimate friend of the Lord, accustomed to lean upon his bosom, be silent as to the fact that it was only through frequent internal conflicts and temptations that Jesus struggled onwards to the full consciousness of his Mes-

[1] Mark iii. 17.
[2] Mark x. 35.
[3] Luke ix. 54.
[4] Galat. ii. 1–10.

sianic office? How can he represent Jesus as advancing at once to the full "revelation of his glory," before he had come clearly to know that he was appointed by the Father to be the Saviour of the world? How can an intimate friend of Jesus, a member of the little circle of the twelve, so represent the relation of the disciples to their master that immediately upon being called they recognized him as the Messiah, and indeed, in the most elevated and spiritual sense of the word? Has not the representation of the earlier Gospels much greater probability, namely, that it was only gradually that the disciples attained to a recognition of the dignity and destiny of Jesus as the Messiah? How can an intimate friend of Jesus put into the mouth of the Baptist, on the very next day after the baptism of Jesus, the confession that Jesus was the Lamb of God taking away the sins of the world, a confession which if it really proceeded from the mouth of the Baptist must necessarily have required the Baptist to join the disciples of Jesus at once in unconditional devotion to his person? We can readily understand how after the lapse of forty or fifty years fables should become mixed with the facts of the evangelical history, handed down as it was from one to another by word of mouth. It is easy to be understood also how the powerful personality of the Saviour should so excite the imagination of the apostolic community as to lead to representations transcending all the ordinary bounds of nature. We find it perfectly comprehensible that, upon an otherwise firm historical background, such pictures should be reflected from the idealizing faculty of the early Christians. But how an eye-witness, intimately acquainted with the facts, and in the evening of his days when the eye is doubly sharp to distinguish

the events of an earlier period, should choose for the representation of the evangelical history a philosophical point of view, and see Jesus only in the brightness of his unbounded preternatural glory, — this we cannot understand.

In the first three Gospels the opposition of Jesus to the politico-theocratic party of the time is perfectly intelligible; for the society moral and religious which he founded had no prospect of success among the Jews except as their theocratic expectations were seen to be groundless and renounced. But that an eye-witness, a born Jew, an apostle, who twenty-five years after the disappearance of Jesus showed a manifest dislike to all personal contact with the Gentile world, and who as far as he was concerned had discouraged every attempt at its conversion, should have conceived of the work of Jesus as specially opposed to the Jews, and so represented it, does not seem at all likely. We can understand how an apostle of Jewish origin should represent Christianity as a fulfilment of the Old Testament prophecy, as a higher stage of the theocratic order, how to him Abraham, Moses, and the prophets are so many different rounds of the ladder which Jesus Christ ascended. On the other hand we cannot understand how an apostle, avowedly of Jewish descent, could speak throughout of the Mosaic law and of the Old Testament institutions as of things obsolete; how he could find no room, no independent position or significance for the Law and the Prophets in the scheme of redemption, and recognize the whole merit of Abraham, whom even Paul calls "the father of the faithful," as consisting in his having seen the day of Christ. Even the discourses of Jesus given in the fourth Gospel could not have been uttered by him in

the connection in which the Evangelist presents them. We will not refer to the almost entirely different character of the discourses of Jesus in the first three Gospels, nor to the fact that in the fourth Gospel he speaks at the beginning of his career just as he speaks at the close, nor to the indefiniteness and obscurity of many of the thoughts and allusions. The simple circumstance alone that Jesus could not possibly have delivered on the evening before his arrest so long and so connected a discourse as is reported in chapters 14–17 of the fourth Gospel is sufficient to show that we have here before us a work carefully prepared at a later period, but not the fresh stream gushing directly from the full heart of Jesus. And how could an eye-witness and participator in those scenes pass over in his narration the most solemn and impressive incident which occurred just before Jesus took his weary way to the cross, the institution of the Last Supper, which left such an ineffaceable impression that it is one of the few facts of the evangelical history which have found mention in an apostolical epistle,[1] an institution which became the early social centre of the apostolic communion, the symbol of the tenderest fraternal love, and soon even the culminating point of religious life? Let it not be said that the Evangelist has omitted to mention the Last Supper because it was universally known and in daily observance and he did not wish to repeat what all knew. Why then did the Apostle Paul repeat this well-known history to the Christians at Corinth? Neither let it be said that of the events of that last night the Evangelist has chosen only such as suited his purpose. Why then did he not pass over the torches and lamps and weapons which were

[1] 1 Cor. xi. 23.

carried by those who at the command of the Sanhedrim went to seize Jesus?[1]

It is a well-known theological device when arguments fail to impugn motives. It has been asked: "Would you then brand the author of the fourth Gospel as a deceiver?" A rude way doubtless to put an end to all learned investigations. Even if some unknown person wrote this Gospel under the name of the Apostle John, it was not, according to the ideas of the time, any grave immoral act, as even the authors of the Old Testament books of Ecclesiastes and Daniel did not believe they were doing anything wrong in publishing those writings under the names of holy men of a former time. In matters of religion such a pious fraud is considered only as a means of securing for the most precious convictions a more willing and more extended acceptance. Besides, is it not very doubtful whether the fourth Gospel was ever intended to pass for the work of the Apostle John? When the Evangelist says:[2] "We saw the glory of the Logos, the glory as of the only-begotten of the Father," considering the peculiar style and method of this writing, we are not compelled to understand these words as intimating that he had seen Jesus with his bodily eyes. He may be understood to mean that he had discerned spiritually the idea or image of Jesus, glorified by the Holy Spirit, indwelling in the Christian Communion.[3] Another passage also,[4] often adduced to prove the author of the fourth Gospel to have been an eye-witness, appears upon closer examination to prove the contrary rather. For although the person who "knows" that the record of the flowing of blood and water from the

[1] John xviii. 3.
[2] John i. 14.
[3] Compare John xvi. 14, 16; xvii. 10.
[4] John xix. 35.

side of Jesus, is "true," may be the author of this Gospel, it is more probable in itself that the Evangelist in these words refers to the author of some fragment used by him, whom not without intention he distinguishes from himself. The conclusion of this Gospel[1] is without doubt by another writer than the author of the twenty other chapters which form a whole in themselves.[2]

When this conclusion, evidently the offspring of the Ephesian group of legends, was affixed to this Gospel the Apostle John had been dead for some time.[3] It was the author of this addition who designed to introduce the Gospel to the Christian body as a work by the Apostle. That he himself was not the Apostle John is proved by the exaggerated conclusion[4] which it has been attempted against all probability to separate from the rest of the chapter as an appendix by itself. It must however retain its connection, as, in the words of Lücke, "There is no reason why the twenty-fifth verse should be separated from the twenty-fourth. On the contrary, the twenty-fifth verse corresponds to the hyperbolical tone of the narrative; and the mode of thought as well as the style of the whole chapter betrays a very different hand from that of the Evangelist."[5] But this very supplement, claiming so confidently to be the work of John, is a newer evidence of how little the religious enthusiasm of that Christian period hesitated to circulate its own works in the world under the protecting cover of a highly revered apostolic name.

5. In conformity with these considerations, we can-

[1] John xxi.
[2] John xx. 30.
[3] John xxi. 23.
[4] John xxi. 25.
[5] Commentar. über das Evangelium Joh. II. S. 825.

not in good conscience regard the fourth Gospel in the form in which we now have it as the work of the Apostle and eye-witness, John. We do not however suppose it to be a production, composed with Gnostic aims, of a Gnostic of the first, or indeed of the last half of the second century. That the Apostle John lived and labored for some length of time in Ephesus is certain. It is not improbable that, having lived and labored in Jerusalem as an apostle to the Jews up to the time of the last Roman war, he there in Ephesus became more enlarged in his views. In this city he was brought into connection with the larger body of Gentile Christians. Here he may be supposed to have gradually got rid of much of his Jewish narrowness, and to have approached in substance the theology of Paul, the principles of which acting upon his peculiar temperament modified in part and elevated his earlier ideas. The idea of his Master also became transfigured in his mind. And thus from the time of his abode in Ephesus there was formed by him, under the predominating influence of his peculiar way of thinking, a series of representations of the public career of Jesus, varying considerably from the contents of the first three Gospels. These representations, especially after the death of John, and in consequence of the growth of the Gnostic doctrines, took a speculative coloring. The better elements of these doctrines it was sought to bring into harmony with the facts of Christianity, a partial remoulding of which was thus unavoidable. The personal idea of Jesus was of necessity involved in this process. To satisfy the demands of the new theology, to show in Jesus the brightest possible manifestation of the Godhead, the personal idea of him was withdrawn from the sphere of the human and sur-

rounded with a divine halo. Such representations gave birth to the fourth Gospel, some time indeed after the death of the Apostle John, about the years 110–120, under the influence of those speculative doctrines which as early as the middle of the first century began to appear in Asia Minor. With reference to these speculations this Gospel was composed for the purpose of proving that faith in Jesus Christ meets not only the deepest longing of the heart but also the highest need of the intellect, and that Jesus Christ was not only the Messiah of the Jews but the Saviour of the whole world. It is not to be denied that the author has treated with the greatest freedom the traditional accounts that were accessible to him. He has transferred the scene of the public life of Jesus for the most part to Judea, because he wished to mark as sharply as possible the opposition of Jesus to the central principle of the Jewish theocracy. He has made a typical allegorical use of the Christian legends. Here and there he has clothed the profoundest ideas of Christian truth in the garb of external events. Standing at a distance from the time and place of the evangelical history he has looked at Jesus only in the completion of his earthly struggles and conflicts, and poured around the pains and weaknesses of his earthly development the light of a heavenly transfiguration. Important events recorded in the original documents known to him, he has omitted when they did not suit his main idea. And he has introduced into his history the antagonism of Christianity to Judaism, seen from the stand-point of his time and immediate surroundings, and also as it looked to him after the judgment of God had been executed in the destruction of the central seat of the theocracy. But he has not wilfully undertaken

to invent or create fictions and fables. He has elevated into the region of eternal thought, and invested with the transfiguring glory of a later century, a selection of reminiscences from the Christian traditions, taken out of the framework of their history in time. He has done this with an understanding of the interior being and the loftiest aim of the life of Jesus, as it could not have been done at an earlier, and, morally considered, narrower time. The fourth Gospel, therefore, serves as a really historical authority for the representation of the moral being of Jesus, but in a high and spiritual sense of the word. Without this Gospel the unfathomable depth, the inaccessible height of the Idea of the Saviour of the world would be wanting to us, and his boundless influence, ever renewing our collective humanity, would forever remain a riddle. In the several particulars of his development, Jesus Christ was not what the fourth Evangelist paints him, but he was that in the height and depth of his influence; he was not always that actualized, but he was that in truth. The first three Gospels have shown him to us still wrestling with earthly powers and forces. The fourth Gospel portrays the Saviour glorified in the victorious power of the Spirit over his earthly nature. The former show us the Son of Israel struggling in his humanity up towards heaven; the latter, the King of Heaven, who descends, full of grace, from the throne of eternity into the world of men. Our portraiture of him must not disregard the natural, earthly foundation of the first three Gospels, if it aims to be historically real; but it can be an image of Jesus eternally true only in the heavenly splendor of the light which streams from the fourth Gospel.

NOTES.

[*a.* p. 21. Notwithstanding the importance which Dr. Schenkel attaches to the question concerning the origin of the four Gospels, — and the learning and ability with which he treats it here and in his Appendix entitle his opinions to the greatest respect, — I cannot but think that it is a question of quite secondary interest, by no means of so vital a character as is commonly supposed. Even were we utterly in the dark upon this point, had these writings come down to us anonymously, unattended by any evidence whatever as to their dates and authors, it would not be impossible that they might still be true, and their truth might be ascertained with a confidence which no subsequent information we might obtain in regard to their origin and history could increase.

The general aspect of this subject is curious and suggestive. At the very outset, it is remarkable that we have not a word written, or directed to be written, by Jesus himself. If the movement initiated by him were of so organized a character as is generally supposed, or even as Dr. Schenkel in these pages represents it to have been, it is strange that we have no such written word. We might at least expect that such writings as are handed down to us would bear names of the highest possible authority, — if not the name of Jesus himself, yet the names of his most trusted, his most intimate friends, the persons who were nearest to him, and who might be supposed to have best known and understood him. But how stands the case in fact? We have four different writings, but only two of them bear the names of immediate disciples, and one of these two (Matthew) was of no eminence among the twelve. Why have we not instead a Gospel of Peter, and a Gospel of James? The one other apostolic name among the four Evangelists is, it is true, a name of the first authority, John. But that the name of John properly belongs to the Gospel ascribed to him, is confidently denied by Dr. Schenkel and other scholars of competent ability and learning. And indeed, as to the remaining three Gospels, the learned conclusion now is, that they are none of them original documents, — that they are made up, to a greater or less extent, from one or more previously existing records. By whom these previous writings were prepared is a point upon which no light falls.

Now, in this state of the case, does it not occur to us to consider whether the anxiety to secure for the Gospels apostolic authority may not possibly be as unnecessary as it is proved to be fruitless? Are there not reasons, plain and strong, why neither the Apostles nor any of the immediate friends of Jesus were either disposed, or indeed particularly qualified, to write out anything like a full life of their Master?

In the first place,—and here is a fact, the bearing of which seems never yet to have been perceived, — the first disciples, after the final disappearance of Jesus, were all on the tiptoe of expectation, looking for his almost immediate return, and for events which for splendor and importance would immeasurably exceed everything that had yet been witnessed. The grand Coming was to take place in that generation; so they believed. How could it have occurred to them that there was to be any posterity for whose information and guidance it was incumbent on them to make careful provision? Was not Jesus himself coming in full power to take charge of all things?

And, in the next place, even if the immediate disciples of Jesus had deliberately undertaken the work of writing an account of him, would not the fact of their standing so near to him and being so devotedly committed to his cause, while in obvious respects it fitted them for the task, nevertheless have operated in some measure as a disqualification therefor? With all their affection for him, had they not preconceptions of his office in conformity with which they would, unconsciously indeed but none the less decidedly, have sought to shape the story? Could they in a word have possibly told it so objectively as it has now actually been told, in the wise providence of Heaven? Is it not remarkable, — does it not strongly corroborate this suggestion, — that, of the four Gospels that we have, it is the two that bear apostolic names, Matthew and John, which show themselves marked by dogmatic biases, and come to some extent under the class of *Tendenz* writings? The Gospel of John avows a purpose, in so many words (ch. xx. 31). The Gospel of Matthew, as Dr. Schenkel thinks and proves, betrays a strong Jewish coloring, appearing in its numerous references to the Old Testament. So plainly is this Gospel thus marked, that if Matthew really had any considerable share in writing it, it is here chiefly in these quotations from the Old Testament, that the hand of the Apostle is visible, coloring the story with a view to win his countrymen, the

Jews. There are critics, ancient and modern, Dr. Schenkel with the rest, who trace the mind of Luke's apostolic friend Paul in Luke's Gospel. Mark is supposed to have written his Gospel under the eye of the Apostle Peter; but if Peter had had anything to do with Mark's Gospel, I doubt very much whether Dr. Schenkel would have found the second Gospel the simplest, reflecting the truth most correctly. Most assuredly Mark's account of the Transfiguration would not have been what Dr. Schenkel thinks it, the least embellished of the three accounts, had the Apostle Peter had any hand in it.

All things considered, my own strong persuasion is, that the original records out of which our present Gospels were formed, were written long before our Gospels were composed, and were slowly getting into circulation when they took their present shape, and that the relation of the Evangelists to the writings which respectively bear their names, was chiefly editorial. And this supposition that the original records were written very early, years before they took their present form, very near the time of Jesus himself, not impossibly some portions of them before and at the time of his death, finds its foundation in *the intrinsic character of the facts related, and in the manner in which they are told.* When we gain any insight into them and see them as they were, they are found to be at once so natural and so original, — they stand out so well defined and so impressively, that it seems just as natural and necessary that some one or more of those who witnessed them should have been moved to write down what they heard and saw as that any should have been prompted to tell what they had seen and heard by word of mouth. The facts related were so full of power, — power to excite wonder, admiration, the deepest in man's nature, — that it could not be but that they must have taken such possession of some one or more individuals, — exercised such an authority over them, that they could no more resist or postpone the impulse to record them than they could hold their breath for any length of time. And thus they wrote these things because, although they were not aware of it, Truth, God, commanded them to do so, not supernaturally but naturally, most naturally. Never was there a growth more truly natural than these writings. The sun does not shine more naturally. Most emphatically may it be said of them, that they wrote themselves.

And when we turn from the facts to the narratives, the same impressions are produced. I think no one can study the Gospel

accounts carefully without perceiving, through and underneath their Jewish coloring and the peculiarities of their time and style, visible traces of records which owe their existence to a simple, fresh, and strong sense of truth. The common idea is, that the things told in the Gospels were for a long time repeated orally, that they constituted the subjects of the apostolic preaching, and that by and by, after a while, they got written. If it were so, what could have saved them, in passing from mouth to mouth, from being greatly changed and from losing the original simplicity and freshness by which they are now characterized in so remarkable a degree? When written and even printed books are not secure from a corruption of the text, what could have saved these accounts from a hopeless perversion, had they existed for any length of time only orally? It is much more likely that they were written first and repeated afterwards than the reverse. The style of these records gives us the impression that they owe their origin to the same impulse, the same motive, that leads people to tell by word of mouth the remarkable things that they witness. They were written before there was any time or temptation to give the coloring of personal opinions to the story of the acts and sayings related. I am constantly struck with the marked absence in them of any such design to make out a case as a devoted and zealous friend could hardly have escaped being influenced by. There is also a minuteness of detail in most of the narratives that looks as if they were the work, not merely of eye and ear witnesses, but of witnesses writing their stories under the first, fresh sense of their reality. There are passages so strikingly marked in this manner that it appears to me as if the things related must have passed at once, on the spot, into a written form. In fine, these writings have the air of being the work of persons not greatly skilled indeed in literary composition, but having no object but to give expression to an irrepressible sense of remarkable facts and giving expression to it instantly, without delay.

But who were these unknown recorders? The question naturally arises, and it admits of some approach to an answer.

Looking at Jesus through the grand organized consequences of his life, we at this day are disposed to regard him as at the head of a movement which he was mostly engaged in shaping with a view to remote ends. If M. Renan in his Life of Jesus goes too far in representing Jesus as working without aim, or consistency of purpose, Dr. Schenkel, I apprehend, goes too far in an opposite

direction, when he gives us the impression that Jesus had a plan in view, simple and comprehensive it is true, but somewhat Jewish. The records hardly warrant this view. It is, however, in conformity somewhat with popular ideas. In consequence of this way of thinking, it does not occur to us that any one could possibly have felt any interest in him but those who formally committed themselves to his cause. But I apprehend he was looked upon very differently in his own day. At least at the first, and for some time afterwards, one so informal as Jesus, who threw out those striking things by the wayside, and whose acts as well as his sayings were singularly extemporaneous, must have attracted the attention of the curious and been viewed by them simply as an extraordinary person, a wise, original and fearless teacher; and others, many others, there must have been, besides those who formally attached themselves to him, who were not insensible to his powerful personality. The dominant religious class, jealous of any influence that endangered their power over the people, were quick to take alarm and to set themselves in fierce opposition to him. They would fain have crushed him and all memory of him at once and forever. But we must not commit the error of supposing that in those days there existed only two classes: the professed, pledged disciples of Christ on the one hand, and his unbelieving opponents on the other. There was then, as there always is in like cases, another and a large class, who were either wholly neutral or uncommitted lookers on, more or less favorably disposed towards Jesus and his adherents. Have we not instances of this class in Nicodemus, in Joseph of Arimathea, in the scribe mentioned in Mark (xii. 28–34), in Simon the Pharisee, who invited Jesus to an entertainment in his house, in the Roman centurion, of whom we read in the 8th ch. of Matthew, in Cornelius, whose story is related in the 10th ch. of Acts, and who sought the acquaintance of Peter, and finally in the "many among the chief rulers" who believed in Jesus but did not avow their belief (John xii. 42)? Does not the internal character of the Gospels suggest the supposition that it is among persons of this description that the authors of the "many" (Luke i. 1) first written accounts of the sayings and acts of Jesus appeared? Surely there must have been many a scribe, many a student of the Jewish traditions, who felt that the things said and done by him as truly deserved to be recorded as those of the ancient Rabbins.

This supposition does not forbid the belief that important por-

32914
232.9
S324c
v.1
THE CINCINNATI BIBLE SEMINARY
LIBRARY

tions of the Gospels were directly derived from the immediate actors in the scenes described. As Nicodemus went to Jesus himself; as certain Greeks, travellers, present at the great national Festival of the Jews when Jesus himself was there, desired to see so extraordinary a person (John xii. 20–21); so is it highly probable that there were individuals who sought out the friends and disciples of Jesus to gather from them information concerning him which they at once wrote down. At such solicitation of strangers, more, in the first instance, to gratify a strong curiosity than to produce conviction, Peter, John, and others of the first disciples may have related many of the passages in the Life of Jesus which are now on record.

Even if we yield to Dr. Schenkel's able statement, and conclude with him that the fourth Gospel is not the work of the beloved disciple, it is yet by no means improbable that the author of it had access to the Apostle and obtained immediately from him those portions of this remarkable work which bear so deep an impress of reality. Can we not easily understand how its profoundly spiritual author, not with the slightest design to deceive, not to secure "the protecting cover of a highly revered Apostolic name," but for very modesty's sake, gave the whole credit of his work to John, honestly feeling that the truth which it contained had been derived from the Apostle? Notwithstanding the marked peculiarities of the fourth Gospel, so faithfully pointed out by Dr. Schenkel, he concedes that this Gospel "is connected in part with evangelical traditions, and follows historical documents," which is evident enough, however, from the internal character of portions of it.

If the foregoing suggestions have any weight, then the fact, stated by Dr. Schenkel as "the certain conclusion of recent learned investigations," namely, that in the first three Gospels the figure of Jesus is not drawn by the hand of any one of the Apostles, is far from impairing the substantial credibility of these records. Nothing certainly is lost by admitting this conclusion of the learned. The original documents, out of which our present Gospels are formed, and in the probable existence of which the critics seem to be pretty well agreed, may have had an origin even more natural and satisfactory than if they had been composed by the Apostles themselves.

After all, however interesting this inquiry into the origin and history of the four Gospels may be, it is not, I repeat, a matter of

primary importance when or by whom they were written. The evidences of their truth are inwrought into their whole texture. The diamond is a diamond, and may be seen to be a diamond, although we know not when or where it was found.

b. p. 22. The author here states, as if it were peculiar to the Gospel of Mark, that no mention is made in it of the Ascension. But there is no distinct mention made of the Ascension in any one of the Gospels, none whatever in either the first or the fourth. All that the third states is that Jesus was parted from his disciples, and "*carried up into heaven*," which is not necessarily to be understood as the statement of a visible fact. If Jesus simply left his disciples, bidding them farewell, the natural inference on their part would be that he was taken up to heaven. The story of the bodily Ascension of Jesus is found only in the book of Acts. And it is easy to see how it grew out of the language in which his disciples spoke of his final departure.

c. p. 27–29. I do not know that there is anything that distinguishes the character of Jesus more strikingly than its wonderful simplicity. He is at once the most original and the most natural of men. His utterances and his acts are uniformly, to an unequalled degree, spontaneous. They seem to be born always of the occasion and of the circumstances. They all come to him and from him as naturally as his breathing. Not until we are liberated from the influence of the extremely false representations that have been made of him do we discern the wonderfully natural quality of his character. But when it comes to be distinctly seen and fully appreciated, it will be seen also how impossible it must have been to interpolate into his history acts of an extraordinary character that he did not really perform, without creating an immediate and deep sense of their glaring inconsistency with him. You might as well think to insert into one of the dramas of Shakespeare a new scene that should not only harmonize with the whole piece, but so harmonize with it as to give it, in all its parts, a new and consistent significance. Nay, more: You might as well attempt to invent a new animal, new in its whole organization, and of a high rank among organized existences and at the same time in perfect harmony with the whole animal kingdom.

Looking upon the character of Jesus thus as the work of the

inimitable genius of Nature, produced in her loftiest mood, and marked all over and imbued with her spirit, the first and almost the only question I am disposed to ask respecting any one of the so-called miraculous relations contained in the Gospels is: Does it or does it not illustrate the person of Jesus? If it does not, if in its form and manner it does not show him to me in his characteristic simplicity, I conclude that it is either a fiction or too imperfectly reported to be understood. On the other hand, if it is in keeping with his personality, if his manner of performing the alleged act is characteristic of him, perceiving thus its accordance with nature in Jesus, who is the most luminous illustration of nature of which I have any knowledge, I conclude that it also accords with all nature, however it may seem to be a departure from the physical order of things. Any confirmation which this conclusion lacks I find in our ignorance of physical laws. Prof. Schenkel undertakes to say that some of the miracles ascribed to Jesus violate all the laws of nature. But who knows all the laws of nature? Is not all our knowledge confessedly partial and superficial, especially in regard to the laws pertaining to matter and mind? Are we not constantly discovering new laws? And is not the presumption inevitable that there are methods of nature still hidden from us?

I agree with Prof. Schenkel that it "lies in the nature of the case that a life like that of the Saviour should, immediately upon its mortal ending, be invested with a rich coloring of fable. The stories of his nativity and the reports of his ascension confirm this idea. Thus it may be seen how possible it was that fables should gather round even the public career of Jesus; and this was the more possible, the more the popular imagination was impressed by what he actually did." (p. 28.) Nevertheless it is the object of a critical examination of the four Gospels to discover where precisely, and in what particulars, fable is mingled with the history. The mere presumption, strong though it may be, of the existence of this fabulous admixture does not justify us in dismissing at once as fable everything in these accounts that at the first blush appears to be out of the ordinary course of things. The sceptical school rejects as fables all the accounts which have any appearance of being miraculous. But there is one class of miracles recorded to which no objection, founded on the idea of their being departures from the laws of nature, can be made. I refer to the cases of the nervous and mental diseases instantaneously cured by

Jesus. There is nothing in these cases that is not plainly natural, unusual as they are. We see and know enough of the powerful effect which the mind, in certain states, has upon the body, to see also that these cures are entirely credible. Prof. Schenkel finds no difficulty here. Here he can trace the influence of the mind upon the physical organization. But where this influence is not traceable, as in the case of leprosy, he is embarrassed. And yet what authority is there for concluding that where that influence ceases to be traced by us, there it ceases to exist? Does not a purely spiritual philosophy teach us to regard the immaterial part of us as the centre and source of our vitality? And is it not worthy of remark that Jesus always addressed himself directly to the mind of the sufferer, whatever might be the bodily affliction he was laboring under, and always recognized most emphatically the agency of faith, a mental, spiritual, moral force, in the work of cure? Nay, not only did Jesus direct his power to the minds and not to the bodies of the sick and the lame and the blind, but it is a circumstance that deserves the profoundest consideration that, in the three instances recorded of the raising of the dead, he addressed the dead as if he were speaking to the living. He made no application of power to dead bodies. And on that great occasion, the raising of Lazarus, he affirmed in words that are still sounding with an indefinable solemnity through the world, that faith would prove victorious over death itself. Thus, by his express declarations, and by his whole mode of action in relation to the wonderful effects produced by him, Jesus himself points us to the deep spiritual philosophy by which those extraordinary facts may be explained.

A great deal of ingenuity has been expended in the attempt to show that the miracles of the Gospel are fabricated upon the model of the Old Testament miracles. But an apparent and superficial resemblance between the two weighs nothing against the positive marks of truth and nature that characterize most of the accounts of the former. The difference is obvious and great between the restoration of the Shunamite's son by Elisha (2 Kings iv. 32–36.) and the narrative of the raising of Lazarus.

That some of the so-called miracles are ordinary events exaggerated, and that others are too imperfectly reported to be now understood, I have no question. But in most of them there is an element, of the conditions and force of which we have only partial knowledge, and which Jesus uniformly recognized under the

name of *faith*. Until we ascertain the limits and the operation of this mysterious power, we cannot with Prof. Schenkel regard any of the extraordinary acts ascribed to Jesus as implying his possession of Omnipotence. The people who witnessed the restoration of the widow's son to life at the word of Jesus drew from the fact no such inference. Awe-struck as they were on that occasion, they gave glory to God and said, "A great prophet is risen up among us" (Luke vii. 16). — TRANS.]

SECOND SECTION.

THE DEVELOPMENT.

CHAPTER III.

JESUS BEFORE HIS PUBLIC APPEARANCE.

Over the childhood and youth of Jesus there rests a veil. That his parents were settled in Nazareth, in Galilee, the evangelical tradition warrants us in believing. Nazareth must certainly be considered his birthplace.[1] Here, in humble circumstances, he grew up. His father, one of the people, belonging to the laboring class, a carpenter, whose calling was learned also by his eldest son,[2] was at the head of a numerous family. In this condition Jesus early learned to know the cares and troubles of limited means. He had four brothers, and probably he had sisters also. A child of the people, he shared from his earliest youth in the sorrows and joys of the people. Whatever there was of genuine, pious feeling, and of the pure morals of humble life in his immediate surroundings, his spirit, susceptible as it was of all that was good, early imbibed. In his earliest childhood he learned to deny himself, and to bow in those limited circumstances to the dispensations of Heaven. In such a situation, his soul was untouched by the temptations to vanity, levity, and the love of pleasure, inseparable from richer and brighter

[1] Mark vi. 1; Matt. xiii. 55. [2] Mark vi. 3.

conditions of life. All the more vividly from his earlier youth did he take in with both eye and heart the wants and the privations of the lower and middle classes of the people. Doubly did he feel for the lowly and the poor, because in his youth he had borne their burdens with them, and with them had suffered need.

Only one evangelical report has been preserved for us of the period of his early youth. Upon the occasion of a national festival, at the age of twelve years, he accompanied his parents to Jerusalem.[1] That in the crowded city he should have left them, to be found after a long search in the Temple among the Rabbins, taking a lively interest in their proceedings, is a sign of early spiritual and moral development, but not of any unchildlike presumption. He mingled in the conferences of the teachers and was kindly listened to. To the questions that were put to him, and which were doubtless appropriate to his age, the striking answers that he gave drew upon him the unmingled admiration of all present.

This story is not incredible, especially as it is wanting in all the marks of fabulous exaggeration. An early ripeness of mind, an earnest thirst for the knowledge of truth and for communion with God, were without doubt manifest in the growing boy, and attracted the attention of a large circle. His conduct in Jerusalem is not inexplicable. As the opportunity of moral and religious progress opens for him, all other earthly duties retire before it. Thus his leaving his parents without asking permission or giving them any notice, thereby occasioning them great anxiety, is explained and justified. It is characteristic of an enthusiasm for lofty aims, that, absorbed in them, it forgets other

[1] Luke ii. 41.

things which may seem to lie nearer to it. And it is on account of this undivided devotion to the Highest, this unwearied love of truth, this inextinguishable aspiration after God, which drove him at twelve years of age into the midst of the teachers of his people, seeking and inquiring, not teaching and communicating, that he was a riddle even to his parents.[1] They had on their part up to this time observed nothing extraordinary in him. He had not outwardly in any respect exceeded the limits of the natural and the customary. On this account his behavior at Jerusalem seemed to them simply as a departure from the obedience which was their due. Of wilfully withholding such obedience, Jesus on the contrary was not conscious. That, to the parental reproach: "We have sought thee with anxiety," (which thou oughtest to have spared us,) he also replied with a reproach: "I was in my Father's house, where I belong," (and where, had you understood me, you might easily have found me,) throws a striking light upon the bent of his character. Of a childish outbreak of disobedience there is in this reply no trace. But on the contrary we see here an early presentiment, not to be suppressed, of his destined devotion to the concerns of the Divine Kingdom, and of his duty to subordinate his earthly duties to his eternal calling.

On the other hand, we must take care not to give too deep a meaning to the words of Jesus: "Ought I not to be about my Father's business?" So he may well be supposed to have expressed himself; but no ray of consciousness of his Divine Sonship breaks from these words. Not then did he declare his divine origin, or wish to proclaim his future Messiahship. Under the

[1] Luke ii. 50.

Old Covenant, pious Israelites acknowledged and worshipped God as their "Father"; in earnest yearning after the pitying Father of his people, the youthful Jesus turned his steps to the Sanctuary in Jerusalem. Had he gone among the Rabbins conscious already of a divine mission, and in the full feeling of his Messianic office, he would not have satisfied himself with returning striking answers to pointed questions; but, as a preacher of repentance and a herald of salvation, although only twelve years old, he would have felt himself bound to lift up his voice among them in warning and consolation. That nothing of this kind is related of him seems to show us how human is the first line of the portrait of his character drawn by the gospel history.

With an insight not yet matured into the great problems of religion, there is shown in him at this period an extraordinary depth of religious sensibility, before which the feeling of filial piety, already beginning to fade, vanished away. The Evangelist has not omitted to intimate that similar incidents did not often occur in his youth. As if to erase the disagreeable impression produced by this independent conduct with regard to his parents on the part of the child Jesus, we are told that he went back from Jerusalem to Nazareth, and was there subject to his parents.[1] He does not appear to have expressed himself in the same way on any other occasions, as his mother kept laid up in her memory this incident as the only one of the kind. The spirit of the boy was withdrawn into itself, and after-generations have cherished a fond remembrance of the still, pious young life that he led from this time on, inwardly growing, steadily fashioning itself, and

[1] Luke ii. 51.

thus, through spiritual concentration, unfolding into power. He not only increased in knowledge, but wore that expression of inexhaustible sweetness which not only showed the grace of God but commanded favor with men.[1]

2. For the rest, as to the early culture of Jesus and his preparation for his future calling, we have no certain information. He had not the advantage of any great degree of learned culture. There are no traces of anything of the kind in his public discourses, nor do his contemporaries ascribe learning to him.[2]

The extraordinary insight which he had into the character and tendencies of the different religious parties among his countrymen, he obtained from personal observation and direct intercourse with their chief men and leaders. Doubtless, he early learned to try the ruling spirits and studied those parties profoundly. But he became neither Pharisee nor Sadducee, neither Herodian nor Essene. Devotion to any particular school or sect was incompatible with that moral and religious self-reliance which, even as a boy, he had shown at Jerusalem. The book of nature lay doubtless wide open to him.[3] He surely received many elevating impressions from nature, under the serene sky of Galilee, on the shores of the Lake of Tiberias, and at the foot of the wooded mountains around; yet it was not thus that his character was essentially formed.[4] It was from within outwardly that he grew,

[1] Luke ii. 52. See Appendix, Ill. 3. 61.

[2] John vii. 18. Wholly without proof E. Renan (Life of Jesus) says: "Hillel was the master of Jesus." M. Renan contradicts himself when he adds: "If it be permitted to speak of the master of one so highly original."

[3] [His teachings show as much. — TRANS.]

[4] As E. Renan (Life of Jesus, p. 64) so confidently supposes.

and not in any marked degree the reverse. Even as a youth, we may well suppose he went his own way, repelled by what many magnified, pained deeply by the foolish hopes of his countrymen, — alienated as they were from the love of truth and the earnest work of life, — and with a presentiment, as yet dim, that he was perhaps appointed to show them the better way which they knew not; but it was not till after his thirtieth year that he became fully persuaded that the moment for public action had really come for him.

3. The immediate impulse to enter upon a public career was received by him through John the Baptist. His relation to John is not clear. John was a strict ascetic, a moral preacher who required of the people a return to patriarchal righteousness and virtue. John had perceived the ruinous moral effect of a merely external theocratic religiousness. The widely spread faith, that by mere ceremonial observances sin in the heart could be overcome, was to him an abomination. It was his earnest purpose, in the spirit of the patriarchs and prophets to reform the old theocracy. With this design he introduced a form of purification which was to be observed only under the condition of a previous inward cleansing from sin. Thus outward baptism became his symbol of the cleansing of the individual through inward reformation. He sought to establish an association of persons, sanctified by repentance and self-discipline.[1] The gathering of such a society by John excited the apprehensions of Herod Antipas, to whom it seemed to threaten a political revolution. Josephus does not mention that John entertained any Messianic ideas; but the fact that John condemned the principles and ceremonial observances

[1] Josephus so represents John. Antiq., XVIII. 5, 21.

of the theocracy and regarded a moral and religious reformation as a fundamental condition of national improvement leads us to conclude that he believed that the time, promised by the prophets, had arrived, in which the Jewish people were to be cleansed of their sins by a spiritual baptism, and, like gold and silver in the fire, to be purified for the sacrifices of righteousness.[1] That he himself was not the Messiah, he felt and confessed. That he was to prepare the way of the future deliverer as his forerunner, he might consider as possible, since such a harbinger had been predicted by Malachi.[2] At the same time, the Baptist remained essentially within the limits of the Old Testament religion of the Law. According to the description of him in the Gospels, he was a stern ascetic: there was something of monastic gloom in his whole being. His garb, significant of overstrained bodily mortification, his more than simple diet, his abode far from human society, separated him completely from Jesus in his mode of thinking and living. A very different spirit animated him. The more surprising therefore must it seem, that just before his public appearance Jesus sought him out and entered into near relations with him.

That Jesus did thus go to John is an undoubted event of the evangelical history.[3] That no permanent connection between the two resulted from this interview is no less certain. Jesus soon withdrew himself again from John. John did not at any time connect himself with Jesus; and even after the death of Jesus, the disciples of John did not cease to form a distinct

[1] Ezek. xxxvi. 25.
[2] Malachi iii. 2.
[3] Mark i. 9; Matt. iii. 13; Luke iii. 21; John i. 29.

sect.[1] Up to the time of his imprisonment John does not appear to have given any particular attention to the course of Jesus, and only in his prison, at the first, before he was wholly cut off from communication with the outward world, did he receive intelligence of the important labors of the Nazarene; only then does he appear to have entertained the idea that Jesus might be the Messiah whom he had believed to be at hand.[2] But the fact that John neither recognized Jesus as the Messiah, nor directed his disciples to him, renders it probable that the answer which Jesus gave to John, when John sent to him, neither satisfied John nor his disciples of the Messianic office of Jesus.

That John differed in spirit from Jesus is evident also from the fact that he sought to accomplish the moral and religious renovation of his people in a very different way. External forms, the practice of fasting especially, he held to be of great importance and seriously conducive to salvation. Jesus, on the contrary, appointed no fasts for his disciples. The disciples of John sought — probably before the death of their master — to come to an understanding with Jesus on this mooted point, and could not possibly feel themselves flattered by the answer they received. Not only did he compare himself with the bridegroom, and thus indicate that his spirit was of a higher and joyous kind, excluding all that was sombre and melancholy, but he referred unmistakably to John as a man trying to sew a new patch into an old garment, and pour new wine into old skins.(*a*) The attempt of the Baptist to effect a reformation of the people by severe penances and austere, self-mortifying vows, is represented by Jesus, in no ambiguous language, as a method of pro-

[1] Acts xviii. 25; xix. 3.

[2] Matt. xi. 2; Luke vii. 18.

ceeding fundamentally false. It could have no effect, save to aggravate the disorder and ruin which had begun.[1]

With all respect for the personal worth of John, Jesus regarded John's enterprise as essentially more hurtful than useful. And the message which John sent to him from the loneliness of a prison, betraying more of doubt than of faith, appears only to have confirmed Jesus in his judgment. When Jesus pronounced a blessing upon the man who was not offended in him,[2] there can be no doubt, from the connection, that he included John among those who took offence at him. It is true, Jesus recognizes in John his forerunner,[3] and so far he acknowledges him as more than an ordinary prophet. He places him at the head of the administrators of the old law, because he approached nearest to the coming salvation. But this position is one of no peculiar merit of John's. One might easily represent it to be his disadvantage. So near the light, and yet his eyes closed to its beams, — is there not here some defect, a lack of spiritual and moral sensibility? When Jesus declares the least in the kingdom of God to be greater than John,[4] is not a sentence of condemnation passed upon John, in fact, in these words? Do they not exclude him from the kingdom of God? Was he not according to the declaration of Jesus of the number of those from whom the kingdom of heaven suffered violence, that is, by whom it was sought to be entered with all too fierce a zeal,[5] who, although they misunderstood the

[1] Mark ii. 21; Matt. ix. 16; Luke v. 36.
[2] Matt. xi. 6; Luke vii. 23.
[3] Matt. xi. 10; xvii. 12; Mark ix. 12; Luke vii. 27; John v. 35.
[4] Matt. i. 11; Luke vii. 28.
[5] Matt. xi. 12.

still nature of the kingdom, — how like a grain of mustard-seed it was, — yet after all longed for it with the whole heart? Unjust as was the judgment of his contemporaries, namely, that John, asserting as he did deep moral convictions, was possessed by a demon,[1] yet he cannot be regarded as holding rank with the "children of wisdom," for to sew new pieces on old garments, and to put new wine into old skins, is folly.

Accordingly, it is certain that John and his disciples never at any time joined themselves to Jesus, and equally certain is it that Jesus never looked upon John as one who appreciated him and his purpose. Indeed, Jesus never regarded him as a sharer in the kingdom which he himself established. Here it is that the question concerning the original relations between Jesus and John become still more difficult and involved.

According to the common idea, the relation of Jesus to the Baptist was altogether different, and the same evangelical records from which we have gathered what we have above stated seem also to favor an opposite idea. This apparently inconsistent fact may be naturally explained. For the later tradition had, in reference to the relation of Jesus to John, only one object to serve, namely, to represent John as the forerunner of Jesus, sent, independently of Jesus, to prepare the way before him and solemnly and publicly to testify to his Messiahship. This object grew out of the relation of the primitive Christian Communion to Judaism. It was not so much by the spirit and words and works of Jesus as by the proof of the correspondence of his history with the Old Testament

[1] Matt. xi. 18; Luke vii. 33.

types and prophecies, that it was hoped to convince the Jews of the truth of Christianity. Out of this interest there grew an increasing danger to the reliability of the evangelical statements, the farther removed the reporters were from the date of the history. Hence, the less any report serves this object, so much the greater is its credibility, and the reverse. All the accounts which represent John as working apart from Jesus and give us to understand that Jesus did not hold John to be one of his adherents, bear on their face the seal of truth.

That before he commenced his public career Jesus went to John on the banks of the Jordan, and there submitted to be baptized by John, is certain. But why should Jesus be moved to defer to the authority of the Baptist? Here is the riddle. With the common representation of the relation of Jesus to John, such a proceeding does not accord. If Jesus had previously a clear, serene consciousness of being the Messiah, the Son of God, how could he submit to a form of purification which exposed him to the suspicion of still needing to be cleansed from sin? It is commonly sought to avoid this difficulty by considering the baptism of Jesus by John as a consecration to his Messiahship, a solemn introduction to his public work of redemption. But the baptism of John had not at all the character of a consecration; it was a symbol of cleansing, and the baptized person in submitting to this form gave it to be understood that he renounced all unholy thoughts and intentions. We cannot see how Jesus could have stood in need of any such consecration. If he felt himself already consecrated as the eternal Son of God from heaven, how could he deign to be consecrated by a sinful mortal hand? What

could a consecration by John who was the least in the kingdom of heaven, signify to him who was conscious of being the greatest in the kingdom of heaven? And, in the nature of things, is it not the greater that consecrates the less? Is it not the consecrator that gives, and the consecrated that receives? According to the account of the first Evangelist, John felt the impropriety of his baptizing Jesus and refused to do what seemed to him so inconsistent.[1] Beyond question, the first Gospel gives us the later account which seems to justify the inconsistency, while the second and third only state the simple fact that John baptized Jesus.[2] According to the first Evangelist, at the repeated desire of Jesus, John consents to baptize him, yielding to the explanation of Jesus, that he was in the right in demanding to be baptized. But in reality this explanation explains nothing; for how far the baptism of Jesus by John can be called, in a moral or religious sense, the fulfilment of righteousness, is in itself an enigma. The enigma may be solved thus:

It was a later generation that sought to explain the baptism of Jesus by John, a fact which contradicted the then prevalent ideas of the Messianic dignity of Jesus. It represented his baptism as bound by a higher necessity to take place. In what that higher necessity consisted, could not be told. Hence we understand why the fourth Gospel tells us nothing of the baptism of Jesus by John with water, but only of a spiritual baptism, of which the Baptist was called to be the witness. From the point of view of the fourth Gospel, the fact of a baptism of Jesus by John appears wholly inexplicable.[3] We have now to explain the matter historically.

[1] Matt. iii. 14. [2] Mark i. 9; Matt. iii. 13; Luke iii. 21. [3] John i. 32.

When Jesus of Nazareth determined to seek out John,[1] he felt himself first attracted by the impressive apparition of this imposing personage; he himself had not then resolved to engage in the service of the kingdom of heaven. According to the concordant statements of the first three Evangelists, Jesus allowed himself to be baptized by John. After receiving baptism, he withdrew into seclusion. Even on this account, his baptism cannot be regarded as an act of consecration preparatory to beginning his public career. Something else therefore must have led him to John than the wish to be inducted by him into his own public sphere. What this other motive was is the question. It was at first probably a desire to learn by personal observation what John was doing. The preaching of John had produced a peculiar and profound excitement among all classes of the people from the highest to the lowest. A multitude of persons, seized with sorrow for their sins, and with penitential longings, had gathered around him. "All the people"[2] went out to the man of iron in the desert, clad in the shaggy mantle of a prophet.[3] Then, probably, dawned upon the soul of Jesus the consciousness that he too belonged to the people. And where could he gain a more thorough insight into the moral and religious condition of the people than with John in the throng now gathered on the once so quiet banks of the Jordan?

Thus the journey of Jesus to John becomes explicable; but that he mixed with the crowd of sinners who had so much to repent of, that he offered himself like all the rest for baptism, seems incredible. According to the fourth Gospel, Jesus had been until then

[1] Matt. i. 9. [2] Luke iii. 21. [3] John i. 33.

unknown to the Baptist. An interview would soon have satisfied the latter of the singular moral purity and elevation of Jesus. For him who had no sin to be cleansed from, baptism could have no significance. If Jesus, however, desired to be baptized, some special reasons must have moved him thereto. The third Gospel by a fine allusion lets us read in the soul of Jesus the moving cause of his wishing to be baptized:[1] "when *all the people* were baptized," then Jesus also suffered himself to be baptized. He would not keep himself apart from the universal spiritual excitement and moral agitation which had taken possession of the whole people, and from which only spiritual pride, self-righteousness, held itself aloof. Although he did not on his own account enter the ranks of ordinary sinners, — albeit he had struggled often enough, and must yet still oftener struggle with temptation, — yet he felt himself a living member of the people, and it appeared to be a duty, not to be evaded, to take part in the earnest emotion, which, transient though it was, had been awakened by the warning voice of the Baptist in so many hearts. Even if the baptism of John were "for the remission of sins,"[2] — which representation of it, by the way, appears to belong to the later tradition, — it was not therefore personal sins only for which forgiveness was offered, but the more conscious the Baptist was of being the Forerunner of the future Deliverer, the more likely is it that he had in mind the sins of the whole nation to which Jesus by his descent belonged, and whose highest and most perfect representative and mediator he was destined to be. As a humble member of the people, as one who felt that the sins of all were his sins, and that the cleansing of all was his own

[1] Luke iii. 21. [2] Mark i. 4.

cleansing, as one who could not for a moment separate the cause of the people from his own cause, — as such an one he descended into the Jordan and received baptism at the hand of John.

4. Under such circumstances the visit to the Jordan and especially the moment of his baptism had a decisive influence upon the after resolutions and course of Jesus. And here the evangelical history gives us significant hints, although the particulars of what passed are wrapt in the veil of fable. According to the fourth Gospel, the Messiahship of Jesus had been revealed to the Baptist by a vision, and he had been personally commissioned to bear plain witness before all the people that Jesus was the Messiah.[1] According to the same Gospel, the Baptist had at once recognized Jesus, not merely as the Messiah, but as the suffering Messiah, doomed to the death of the cross, and to make atonement for the sins of the world. In these statements, the unmistakable influence is shown of a later tradition, interested in placing John as near as possible to Jesus. But there is not the slightest probability that the Baptist ever distinctly recognized the Messianic destiny of Jesus, to say nothing of his bearing testimony before the whole people to the divine Sonship of Jesus. Just as little ground is there for the assumption that it had been revealed to him in a vision and at the baptism of Jesus, that Jesus was the Messiah. As he had not known Jesus before his baptism,[2] such a vision could have been accorded to him only by means wholly preternatural. In this case his testimony could have had no personal weight, as it was not a matter of personal knowledge; and, indeed, after this alleged testimony to the divine Son-

[1] John i. 32. [2] John i. 33.

ship of Jesus, John still continued to be less than the least in the kingdom of heaven.

The account of the fourth Gospel can therefore prefer no claim to historical credibility in the usual sense of the word. This is here the ruling idea of the fourth Gospel but thinly disguised. The account given of the homage paid, in consequence of a divine revelation, by John to Jesus is intended to show forth the transcendent majesty of Jesus, from which every trace of the noblest and the best in the Old Testament religion represented by John disappears. John himself, contradicting his own peculiar calling, and in the midst of following it, has to testify that not human forms and penances, but only a divine self-sacrificing love could avail for the deliverance of humanity. This theory of the fourth Gospel agrees perfectly with its subsequent representation of the work of John and of Jesus. In the light of this Gospel, the last shadows of the Old Covenant still cast by John soon melt away.

But such was not the original relation between John and Jesus; and not in the fourth Gospel, but in the first three, especially in the second, is it most correctly represented.

During his stay in the desert of the Jordan, under the impressions made on him by the Baptist and after he had been baptized, the conviction was formed, with ever-growing clearness, in the mind of Jesus, that the way of the Law was no longer the way of salvation for his people. There, at the Jordan, he saw, in spirit, heaven open; there he felt the breathing presence of the Father; there he heard the divine voice declaring the divine pleasure in him as the beloved son.[1] There,

[1] Mark i. 10; Matt. iii. 16; Luke iii. 21.

for the first time, he saw clearly and surely that the sin-burdened people could not attain to truth and peace by the path proposed by John. There his path parted forever from the Baptist's. The opened heaven was the symbol of the reconciliation offered by God to man. At the Jordan it became plain to Jesus that his people could attain to inward peace only by being reconciled to God. According to the legend, the Spirit is said to have descended upon him in the form of a dove. At the Jordan the conviction came to Jesus that only the tender, gentle spirit of humility and love, of which the dove is the symbol, could effect a moral renovation of the people. A voice from heaven must have assured him of the divine approbation. At the Jordan, for the first time, he recognized it as the will of God that he was destined to undertake, in this spirit, the reconciliation and regeneration of his country. As a flash of light from above, this illumination came to him;[1] while the Baptist, although he looked for the future Messiah, was not able to recognize the man present as the Promised one of Heaven. For that the Baptist's expectations of a Messiah differed from the popular ideas only in the moral earnestness with which he cherished them, is evident from the peculiarity of his course, and from the subsequent judgment pronounced upon him by Jesus. As he did not find in Jesus the realization of his ideal of the Messiah, he never joined Jesus, and his disciples, after his death, continued to look for him who was to come.[2]

While Jesus went to the desert, drawn thither at the first by the powerful personality of the last of the Old Testament prophets, breathing the spirit of Elias,

[1] Mark i. 10. [2] Acts xix. 4.

he was there impressed by the great moral and religious movement which agitated all classes of the population. For the first time, the spectacle of the wretchedness and misery of the people of his day was laid bare before his eyes; in sympathy with them he went down into the purifying stream from which they hoped to receive a new, regenerating strength. But it was through his intercourse with the last prophet of the Law that he came to a clear consciousness of the difference between himself and even this purest and noblest manifestation of the old religion; and, like light from above, it opened upon his soul that only out of an immediate consciousness of God and the tenderest love for man could new life be breathed into his people. Thus, at his very first contact with the people, hungering for spiritual life in the wilderness of Jordan, there sprung up in him, as the central life of his being, that tender, holy humility, which did not separate itself self-righteously from the masses, but, lovingly sympathizing with them, took their suffering and sins upon itself.

In his intercourse with John and those around him, however, Jesus did not attain to a consciousness of his Messiahship. He was convinced indeed that the theocracy was no longer equal to the work of regenerating the Israelitish people, and that a new divine work was necessary to their renovation. That he was to be the instrument thereof, he had as yet only a presentiment, but at no decisive conclusion had he yet arrived. The evangelical narrative erroneously, with a manifest anachronism, places at the commencement of the public career of Jesus what came to maturity only at a later period. And to do this it is obliged to have recourse to supernatural powers, and to repre-

sent as brought about by a miracle, either outwardly, in the presence of the multitude, or inwardly, in the consciousness of the Baptist, what could not have taken place in the process of spiritual growth, or according to the laws of historical probability. If things really happened as they are stated, then would the character of Jesus be transported beyond the bounds of human development into the region of the supernatural, and he would become an inexplicable enigma. But it is precisely the events that now follow which show luminously how far Jesus was, during his sojourn with John, from having arrived at any firm determination in relation to his future public action.[1]

NOTES.

[*a.* p. 64. THERE is not necessarily any such invidious reference to the Baptist, as our author supposes, in Mark ii. 21, and the parallel passages in Matthew and Luke. Consider the circumstances. One of the first causes of offence that Jesus gave was the bad company he kept. Odious tax-gatherers and abandoned persons of both sexes in great numbers not only followed him but were admitted into "his house" and to his "table" (Mark ii. 15). The next offence given was that he imposed no religious observances, no fasts, upon these people. "If he will have these miserable wretches about him," one can hear the Pharisees muttering, "why, instead of eating and drinking with them, does he not require them to fast? Surely if John's disciples and we Pharisees who are not as other men are, — if we fast, why does he not make his disciples fast? They certainly need to mortify their flesh. It is corrupt enough, Heaven knows." Now the fact was that the immediate disciples of Jesus and the poor degraded outcasts that were thronging around him were in no condition of mind for any such austerities. Although the latter class, those "sinners," did not perhaps understand themselves, and could not have told what it was, — what the new and strange feel-

[1] See Appendix, Ill. 4, 75.

ings were that were beginning to stir in their hearts, — yet here was one who had suddenly come and was talking with them, sinning, guilty all over as they were, as a friend and brother; and must he not have seemed to them like an angel coming straight down to them from heaven? Everybody else to whom they looked up — all respectable people — shrunk from them with the stern, stony look of contempt and abhorrence. But from his eyes beamed human respect and fraternal sympathy, and, dim as was their apprehension of his meaning, they nevertheless caught from his looks and tones, charged with feeling and sincerity, emotions altogether new to them. New thoughts, new longings, were awakening in their bosoms. Those hearts, so hardened by vicious practices, were beginning to melt; those eyes were moistened with unexpected tears; and a light that filled them with a new, strange joy was breaking upon their dark and most miserable existence. And as for the immediate disciples of Jesus, Simon and the others, with what brilliant expectations were they becoming intoxicated! Here was their Master producing the most extraordinary sensation, drawing great crowds around him the instant he appeared in public, to all appearances carrying everything before him. What if he should prove to be the personage to whom the prophets pointed, and whom the nation was looking for, — the magnificent Messiah! In what dreams of splendor were their imaginations running riot! Mark now the striking answer which Jesus returned to those who wondered that he did not require his disciples to fast: "Can the guests at a bridal fast?" he exclaimed in effect. "One might as well go to a wedding festival and call upon the company with the bridegroom, the fountain of hilarity, in the midst of them to fast. My disciples are as little fitted for such austere observances as so many wedding guests. But" (and here he adds what no one could have understood at the time, but what shows how, amidst the abounding popularity of the hour, he never lost sight of his own dark fate) "the time is coming when the bridegroom will be taken away from them. Then will be the time for fasting. To require them to fast now," he continued, "in the present joyous excitement of their minds, would be as unwise as to put new cloth to an old garment, or new wine into old wine-skins. They could submit to no such constraint. There is a fitness of things that must be observed." Thus the language of Jesus is found to be full of significance. In order to perceive its point we have no need to look beyond the immediate circumstances of the

occasion, or to suppose that Jesus designed to say anything more than what so plainly appears to have been his meaning.

Prof. Schenkel appears to find unnecessary difficulty in elucidating the relation of Jesus to John the Baptist, and in understanding the baptism of Jesus, and the motive that prompted Jesus to go to John. The notices in the Gospels of these points are not abundant, but such as they are, they appear to me to authorize the following view of the case: —

From all that we know of their subsequent history we are justified in the belief that both Jesus and John must have evinced from their earliest years no ordinary traits of character. They were persons of pre-eminently moral and religious natures. How vastly the superior, however, Jesus was of the two, the respective results of their lives show. The lofty old Hebrew element culminated in John. His spirit was fed from the Past, by the ancient seers and sages of Israel. He was austere and narrow. Jesus, on the other hand, found, as no other ever has done, the nourishment of his spiritual life in his own pure consciousness, where he recognized the intimate presence and heard the living voice of the Highest. Consequently his insight was, beyond all comparison, clearer, his outlook more extensive, his aim loftier, than John's.

They both had pre-eminent discernment of their time. In the moral and religious corruption, especially of the ruling classes who held the destinies of the nation in their hands, both Jesus and John saw the ruin which in less than a century overtook it, — saw it, I conceive, with daily increasing clearness for years before they undertook to announce it publicly. To these two inspired youths, the inevitable catastrophe that was steadily moving towards them was the coming of the judgment of heaven, THE KINGDOM OF GOD. Thus to both the Kingdom of God, which they proclaimed to be at hand, was an historical fact, visible to them in the nature and then existing condition of things.

But there was this difference between Jesus and John: John saw nothing clearly beyond the coming ruin, the overthrow of the then state of things, the "coming wrath" of God; and the only salvation possible in his view was to be secured by a renewed and thorough conformity on the part of the people to the old Hebrew standard of righteousness. It was not in the nature or temperament of John to go beyond this. But to the far deeper insight of Jesus, the approaching revolution was to result in the estab-

lishment upon the overthrow of the old order of a new and grander order of things. Prof. Schenkel appears to regard the kingdom of God as an original conception or scheme of Jesus to form a new association of true Israelites. Whereas, it appears to me from all that Jesus is recorded to have said about it, that what he called the kingdom of God was, to repeat, a pure historical fact existing, and to be more fully developed, in the course and order of the Eternal Providence. It was no vision of his private imagination. He saw its approach in the signs of the time. Incidents that had no meaning to others had a great significance to him. Recollect, for instance, what a revelation to him was the unlooked-for faith of the Roman centurion, by which he was so much surprised. His prophetic insight penetrated that fact, and he looked through it and beyond it, and beheld many coming from all quarters of the earth to sit down with the patriarchs in the kingdom of heaven (Mat. viii. 11). But he saw that kingdom not only coming in events, he felt its presence in his own consciousness of the kingly power of truth and love, in that consciousness out of which bloomed his immortal sayings. "Happy the poor in spirit, for theirs is the kingdom of heaven!" "Happy they who suffer for the right, for theirs is that kingdom also!"

Jesus and John, according to the tradition, were relatives. That they were intimately acquainted with each other before they appeared in public, I infer from the way in which John received Jesus, when Jesus came to him to be baptized: "*I have need to be baptized of thee. Comest thou to me?*" (Mat. iii. 14). And also from the terms in which John spoke of Jesus, for I understand John to allude to Jesus when he told the people of one who was coming after him who was greater than he, — one who stood among them, the latchet of whose sandals he himself was not worthy to unloose. This sounds to me as the fervent expression of personal knowledge and experience. As Jesus and John were thus intimately acquainted, I cannot otherwise than suppose that long before they appeared in public they talked together much and earnestly of the degradation of the times, and of the dark prospects of their common country. In this interchange of thought and feeling, the spirit of each found relief, and light, and strength. And, although John was incapable of rising to the lofty elevation of Jesus, incapable of throwing off his Hebrew prepossessions, yet the stronger character of Jesus exercised a powerful influence upon the Baptist, kindling his religious fervor into

a flame. Possibly in those early days Jesus communicated to no one the high thoughts that were beginning to rise within him, and which at the first he could hardly define, even to himself. It was, however, we may suppose, the inspiring influence of the personal character of Jesus that, acting upon the ardent temperament of John, operated as one cause to render him impatient of the ordinary routine and restraints of life, and eager to give utterance aloud to the prophetic promptings of his soul, and to the warnings, of which his degenerate country stood in such pressing need. Without any understanding with Jesus, but of his own motion, John went and took up his abode in the desert. There he assumed the coarsest dress and lived upon the simplest food. And there, too, as occasion offered, as travellers or any number of people came within hearing, he announced the warning truths that burned in his heart, shouting, like a herald, "Repent ye, the kingdom of heaven is at hand! God is coming to judge this guilty land. Prepare ye the way of the Lord!" The rumor quickly spread of the strange apparition in the desert. The stories told of the dress and austere manner of life and of the language of the extraordinary personage dwelling there,—everything about John, was fitted to attract and impress the minds of his countrymen, and make them feel that the illustrious line of the ancient prophets, so long broken, had now reappeared in the desert. Accordingly, a profound sensation was made by John; and when he summoned the people to forsake their sins, and, in sign of inward cleansing, to bathe in the river sacred in their history, — so congenial was the ceremony to the popular feeling, that the whole country was moved, and from all quarters crowds flocked to the Baptist. In the simple, strong language of the ancient record, "there went out to him Jerusalem and all Judea and all the region round about the Jordan." It was, in fact, a great religious revival, an extraordinary excitement of whatever religious sensibility in the popular heart survived the gross corruption of the times. So powerfully did the popular feeling set toward John that the proud and hollow-hearted Pharisee and the voluptuous unbelieving Sadducee yielded to the current and went with the throngs to the desert. The manner in which the Baptist addressed persons of these classes, when he descried them with their frontlets and phylacteries among the crowd, shows how fully he knew their character: "O, you brood of serpents!" he exclaimed, "who has warned you to flee from the

coming wrath?" He told the people that there was one among them so much his superior that he himself was not worthy to perform for him the most menial office. "I baptize you," he said, "with water (which is external in its influence), but his baptism will be symbolized by the far more searching elements of wind (spirit) and fire from heaven." In these words, as I conceive and as I have already remarked, John refers to Jesus. This strikes me as the language of personal experience. John describes the power of Jesus as it would be described by one who had felt it. The words of Jesus had searched the soul of the Baptist in their private communings like the living breath of heaven, and kindled it into a flame. There was one, he said, to come after him and stand among the people like a husbandman winnowing his wheat, gathering the wheat and blowing out and burning up the chaff. This is a description of the personal power of Jesus, not of the official action of the Messiah.

In the mean time, before and after John appeared thus moving all men's minds far and wide, Jesus was still in his humble home, still meditating the great work which was gaining more and more complete possession of his heart and to which he was to give himself up utterly. That pure spirit with its infinite tenderness, — how did it shrink from entering upon the path which he saw he must pursue alone, cut off from all human sympathy, with nothing before him but the fiercest opposition and an early and violent death! I do not think we can have any just appreciation of the extraordinary greatness of the character of Jesus until we fully recognize the fact that, as surely as he knew his own exalted aims and as surely as he read the signs of the times and knew the temper of his countrymen, so surely must he have foreseen that he must hold himself doomed, beyond all hope of reprieve, to a lonely fate and an inevitable death, if he dared to obey the voice of God in his soul. Professor Schenkel sees and states that Jesus understood his countrymen and the character of the leading classes, but he does not appear to perceive that this knowledge on the part of Jesus involved a knowledge from the very outset of his own fate. And not perceiving this, he goes, it appears to me, far out of the way, to explain why Jesus went to John to be baptized, and how it was that heaven opened to him at his baptism. The one consideration which throws wonderful light upon this period in the life of Jesus, and indeed upon the whole history of it, is, that he saw before he came forth

that the work which he had meditated from his early years necessitated the utter sacrifice of himself. While he was growing up and for years before he began to execute his great purpose, this purpose was steadily growing in strength. But as he advanced, how did that gentle and tender nature shrink from what was before it! It is not to be doubted that he often fell into profound reveries, often sought solitude, spending hours, lonely hours of the night, in searching self-communings, in agonizing prayer, — the spirit wrestling mightily with the flesh, until at last the conviction of his self-renouncing destiny was rooted and grounded in him beyond possibility of change.

And now the time had come when the whole country was powerfully stirred by John. All classes shared in the religious excitement of the hour. Profoundly in sympathy with humanity, feeling with his fellow-men and for them as no other did, Jesus caught the spirit that was swaying all men's minds, in accord as it was with his own spirit. Delaying no longer to take the first step, resolved to rise above all weakness, he went to John to be baptized, in sign of inward cleansing from every infirmity that would hold him back from his great duty, and of self-consecration to the divine ideal, which was to be afterwards baptized, as he knew, in his own blood. As no loftier spirit then used that simple form of self-dedication, so, in all the crowds that flocked to the baptism of John, there was no one to whom it was so full of significance as it was to Jesus. It was a great decisive hour, an era in his personal history. From that moment, pure and true as his previous years had been, all was changed, and he was born to a new and yet higher life. He entered then into heaven. He ascended to the very bosom of the Everlasting Father, and felt his own heart beating in filial unison with the divine soul of universal nature.

There is no passage in the history of Jesus that bears a deeper impress of historical truth than the account of his baptism. While the fact itself harmonizes with the nature of the human soul, the form in which it is related is equally illustrative of the laws of human expression. The instant the great thought of Jesus ceased to be a mere thought and became an act, that instant he had a new experience of its greatness, and so pure, so divine was it, that his whole being was filled with the consciousness of a power and peace before unknown. This consciousness was ecstatic, and how could it be otherwise described by

him than as all heaven opening to him? At such a moment, there is no object upon which his eye should have chanced to rest that his excited imagination would not instantly have transfigured. Such is our human nature. Accordingly when a dove, a common dove, flitted across or hovered within the rapt sphere of his vision, it was at once divested in his eyes of its ordinary appearance. Outwardly it had "the bodily shape" of a dove, it was "like" a dove but, illumined by the spirit of Jesus, it was interpreted and accepted by him as an omen and messenger from the Invisible. And when, further, the ecstatic consciousness of perfect unity with the Highest found expression in a certain passage of ancient Scripture, that suddenly came to him by no conscious action of his will, as such passages will in moments of great religious excitement, how naturally did it seem to him as if communicated by a voice!

Professor Schenkel appears to think, that, in submitting to be baptized by John, Jesus paid undue deference to the Baptist, and acknowledged in him a superior authority. I cannot so see it. Jesus could not have baptized himself. In order that the act should have its full binding significance to his own mind, as a step publicly committing him to his great duty, it was necessary that he should be baptized by another, and therefore he availed himself of the service of John.

Neither in supposing that Jesus went as others went to the Baptism of John, do we confound him, as our author imagines, with the common crowd of sinful men. Jesus had a sacred ideal unattained, from the realization of which, as we may suppose without derogating from his personal greatness, he felt himself held back by the weakness of the flesh. From that infirmity he would cleanse himself, and bind the weak flesh in solemn and irrevocable subjection to the willing spirit. — TRANS.]

CHAPTER IV.

THE RESOLVE TO ENTER UPON A PUBLIC CAREER.

1. The first three Gospels agree in stating that, after receiving the baptism of John, Jesus, under a special influence of the Spirit, took up his dwelling in the "wilderness." There is no reason to doubt the fact. The silence of the fourth Gospel has its cause in the lofty representation of Jesus which this Gospel aims to give. If Jesus were the bodily manifestation of the divine Logos itself, as the fourth Gospel states, he could have needed no special preparation for his public work, still less could he have been exposed to temptation and to spiritual conflicts. The second Gospel gives us the simplest account, when it tells us that, after his baptism, Jesus was driven by the Spirit into the wilderness.[1] The powerful impression made upon him by the contact into which he had been brought with the people longing for mercy and regeneration, had not yet brought him to a final decision. He had a general idea of what he was to do, but the precise course which he was to take lay still dimly before him. He was to meet the wants of the people in a way, true and all-satisfying for all time. He was to fulfil the gracious purposes of God by a path in which no one had preceded him: by all-pitying love and voluntary self-sacrifice. The day of theocratic tutelage had gone by; "the Law and the prophets" no longer sufficed; the traditional creed had become a spirit-killing letter. The hammer of repentance, swung by the

[1] Mark i. 12.

Baptist, could break hearts but not heal them. What a task was it just at that moment to utter the decisive word, to take the first pioneer step out of the letter and dead formulas of the past into the new, living temple of a hopeful future! How natural was the ebb and flow of thought and feeling in that pure soul, glowing with love of God and his country! How inevitable were those anxious hours, when the cry for help, to which there were none willing or able to respond, came to this lowly spirit with ever-increasing urgency! Could he return to the confinement of his humble home, to the irksome restraints of the trade which he had learned, to brothers and sisters who had derided him as the "dreamer," the "enthusiast"? Could he consent again to take part in the routine of the work-a-day world at a moment when it was only by still communion with his God and Father that he could receive the true answer to all his questionings, and be directed aright in his future course? Already, at the Jordan, he had received a sign from his Heavenly Father, — heaven had opened to him; he had inspired the breath of the Divine Spirit, — he had been made conscious of intimate fellowship with God. To be alone now with his Heavenly Father was felt by him as an irrepressible want; far from the throngs that had but just now pressed around him, he longed to probe and prepare himself in solitude, to collect all his powers for the final resolution.

These historical features, essential to a correct delineation of the idea of Jesus, the older tradition has fabulously amplified and miraculously embellished. Satan, the wild beasts, the angels of the second Gospel,[1] show us fable in its first and simplest ele-

[1] Mark i. 13.

ments. Jesus, as the Second Adam, appears during his sojourn in the wilderness to the Christians of the second age as the counterpart of the first Adam during his sojourn in Paradise.[1] In the wilderness as in Paradise, Satan is the seducer; in Paradise the brute world is yet tame and subject to man; in the wilderness the beasts are wild but submissive to Jesus. In Paradise, the angel, after the Fall, is a persecutor of man, the human being; in the wilderness, the angels, after Satan is vanquished, are the willing servants of man. The later tradition added the forty days' fast, and the conversation between Jesus and the Tempter, and the three several temptations representative of the temptations which Jesus had to withstand during his public career.

2. In the solitude of the desert, in prayer and in communings with his Heavenly Father, he meditated the resolve with which his heart was becoming full. That he pondered it very deeply, and that the severest inward conflicts were the consequence, is genuinely human and yet not at all derogatory to a lofty, moral nature. The "Satan," who according to the Evangelical account, came to tempt him, is the "Adversary" of the Old Covenant, the earliest symbolical representative (in the book of Job) of the powers hostile to man, — according to later traditions, hostile to God also. Love of God and man was the moving impulse in the bosom of Jesus. On the banks of the Jordan he had seen clearly that to bring help to the poor suffering people was his most urgent task; but, upon more earnest consideration, what obstacles lay in the way of its execution! Thoughtless, easily excited

[1] Compare the parallel between the first and the second Adam, Romans v. 12.

natures throw themselves, without reflection, into the midst of the greatest dangers ; vanity and pride, ambition, the greed of gain, and the love of power goad them unconsciously on ; they lack the self-control needed to restrain the demons of passion. The history of the Jewish demagogues of that period, the account, for example, of the revolt of Judas, the Gaulonite, from the oppressive taxation of the Roman government, under the pretext that the Jews owed tribute to God alone,[1] the fitful and bloody popular outbreaks which only led to still worse oppression, to a still more hopeless degradation of the masses, afford us a melancholy insight into the politico-democratic delusion of even the better men of that time. The lowly Nazarene, with his pure and pacific spirit overflowing with truth and love, soon recognized such illusions of the "spirit from below" for what they were. He, too, heard in his solitude the voice of the oppressed inviting him to plunge into the maelstrom of popular commotion, to despise opposing dangers and boldly to defy all threatening obstacles. But it was only the voice of Satan, the voice of the tempter, which he must resist, which he must silence in still self-possession, in spiritual communion, in prayer, in obedient subjection to the will of God ; for in no other way could the suffering people be helped. Self-control and self-renunciation, disregard of his own advantage, resignation of power and honor and self-gratification, — these were what, before everything else, was demanded of him. In the three different particulars mentioned, in which Jesus was tempted to procure, by supernatural means, bread, honor, and power, the Evangelical story has indicated

[1] Josephus, Antiq. XVIII. I. 1 and 6. Consult Ewald's History of Christ.

the moral dangers which, from the first, lay in wait for Jesus. Certain it is in every case, the higher the endowment, the greater the temptation.

As Jesus is commonly represented, it is certainly very difficult to conceive of him as really struggling with temptation. The fourth Gospel is silent in regard to any such struggles, and the doctrine of the Church has placed itself on the side of the fourth Gospel. But if in any respect, it is here that the representation of the first three Gospels deserves the preference. It is altogether impossible that the tradition of the temptation of Jesus, which even so early as the second half of the first century was scarcely in harmony with the Orthodoxy of that period and with which much that is told of Jesus even in the first three Gospels is not easily to be reconciled, should be a pure invention. From the circumstance that "Satan" is designated as the tempter of Jesus, we are led to infer that violent struggles, as Jesus himself told his disciples, preceded the final decision. If we cannot bring ourselves to believe that such struggles took place *in* Jesus, we are compelled, apart from the strange account of a bodily and personal interview of Jesus and Satan, to discharge the temptation of all moral worth. If he were conscious of no motions of the will, which might lead to erroneous plans, to false steps and ways, then was he never really tempted; but then in this case the account of the temptation becomes something far worse than a myth, it is a senseless fable.

3. In three points especially there comes to light in the legend of the temptation a genuinely historical fact. According to the story, there at once stirred in the bosom of Jesus, during his seclusion, that mysterious force which we must needs regard as the source of

his wonder-working. According to popular notions indeed, he must have wrought wonders without interruption from his birth, and the apocryphal Gospels, therefore, with their strange stories of the miracles of his childhood, are only a bold statement of the later Church ideas. According to the first three Gospels, the wonder-working power of Jesus is an offspring of the Spirit, which after his baptism dwelt in him in its fulness. Without doubt a deeper consciousness of his spiritual endowments and of his moral mission first awoke in his soul at the Jordan. In the solitude of the desert, after he had received baptism, it must have become his full conviction that his influence was to be of an infinitely higher kind than that of the Baptist. But such a conviction could not be formed but through temptation. To use without due consideration the power of which he had become conscious, and which could so easily rule nature and men, — to devote his rich gifts to the service of self, to avarice and ambition, in a word, to deviate into the false path of Judas the Gaulonite, — was the rock on which Jesus might then have struck.

In another respect also, a significant mark of historical truth appears in the story of the Temptation. How easily might Jesus have been intimidated in the attempt at a public reform by the dangers connected with any movement against the then existing theocratic institutions! It is not to be doubted that he weighed these dangers, and saw them in their full extent. But, according to the story of the Temptation, they were no snares to him. He did not suffer them to turn him from the path on which the Spirit impelled him to enter. They served only to preserve his ardor from excess.

In the fact that it was with passages from the Old Testament that he overcame the suggestions of temptation, we have in this story still a third trait of an unquestionably historical character. It was precisely at that hour of preparation, and self-examination, and self-cleansing, that he must have felt most strongly the need of having recourse to the Sacred Writings of the fathers. We venture to intimate, however, that even these brought with them a certain temptation. For do we not find two directly conflicting modes of representation in these Writings! The people of Israel and their future deliverer glorified, and yet at the same time humiliated. The people earning their bread by labor, yet, through the Almighty Providence of the Lord miraculously fed.[1] Under the Old Covenant the pious man may rest assured that, through the grace of God, guardian angels protect him in all his ways, but he must beware how he tempts the Divine Grace.[2] To the righteous (Abraham for example) the nations are promised as an inheritance, but yet he must be humble before God, as one who has nothing to hope for.[3] Thus the Scripture seems to stand in contradiction to itself.

And there were still more exciting thoughts that arose in the mind of Jesus, still more anxious doubts to be solved, than those which the story specifies as having been suggested by conflicting passages of Scripture. Was not Moses then appointed by God as the Mediator of his Covenant people? Was not the theocratic law with the sacrificial Temple service given by God's command? Was not a chosen priesthood divinely instituted for Israel? Was it not with the observance

[1] Deut. viii. 3.
[2] Ps. xci. 11; Deut. vi. 16.
[3] Gen. xvii. 6; Deut. vi. 13.

of the ceremonial law that the promise of salvation and life was connected? Was not the promised deliverer described in the Holy Scriptures as a royal hero, a Restorer of the power and splendor of the house and kingdom of David, as a political and national Conqueror?

As these things passed through the mind of Jesus, not only were there internal conflicts to be withstood, but he saw himself under the necessity of breaking altogether with the popular understanding of the Scriptures, and taking a decisive stand in opposition to all the then received sacred learning of the dominant Jewish schools. There was no alternative but to break entirely with the theocracy, to arm himself for a life and death struggle with the men in power, the slaves of popular favor, and what to a pure soul like that of the Saviour was most abhorrent, to wear the appearance of a criminal, and expose himself to the suspicion of stirring up a deadly and fatal rebellion against the civil and ecclesiastical authorities. On one side was the alluring prospect of all the brilliant results of a prosperous career: health, honor, power; on the other, the fearful ruin of a life publicly branded with the mark of Cain, destitution, shame, death.

In the solitude of the wilderness, Jesus decided between the two courses. He conquered the temptation. How long the conflict lasted is not certainly known, certainly not longer than the time mentioned, forty days. But, that he was entirely separated from the outer world during his abode in the desert is not likely. It is equally improbable that he abstained all that time from all nourishment. Only when full clearness was vouchsafed to him in regard to the path he was to choose, did he return to his ordinary sphere. The

main temptation was vanquished forever. That it returned occasionally with lessened force and ceased only with his life the third Gospel intimates,[1] when it says, that the adversary left him *for a season*, — which, by the way, is a genuine historical feature.(*a*)

4. It is not probable that Jesus entered upon his public work immediately upon the termination of the great internal conflict.[2] A particular event, the imprisonment of the Baptist, seems first to have determined him.[3] The last worthy representative of the ancient Law was set aside, the last brave voice against the universal corruption an act of royal violence had hushed in blood. Now was the time for Jesus to speak. It is significant that he began his public work just at the moment when the fate of the Baptist had shown how perilous it was to declare the truth. He could not hold his peace any longer. But what was it that those days of preparation and conflict had revealed to him as his mission?

The first three Gospels agree that his public life began with the announcement of the Gospel; according to the second, which in this respect is the most exact, there were four things which the first teaching of Jesus comprehended. 1. The fulfilment of the time; 2. the advent of the kingdom of God; 3. the call to a change of heart; 4. the demand for faith.

It is strikingly characteristic of the career of Jesus, that he began with public *teaching*. His work was wholly and essentially spiritual and spiritually free. To the labor of convincing the people of his time and country, Jesus first of all addressed himself. It may seem as if in this he only followed the lead of the Bap-

[1] Luke iv. 13; xxii. 8.
[2] Mark i. 14; Matt. iv. 12.
[3] Mark vi. 17.

tist. But keen eyes discerned at the first glance an essential difference between him and the Baptist. He did not like the Baptist represent himself as the conclusion, but as the beginning of a new future full of hope. "*The time is fulfilled*," i. e. the old time of the theocracy, of ceremonial tutelage, and of the religion of forms and formulas. That all this had come to an end with the Baptist, Jesus had divined at the Jordan in the dawn of a higher illumination. Although he recognized and declared himself to be the representative and advocate of a new age, he certainly had not arrived at a consciousness of being the Messiah of the Jews. Conscious was he of being a man anointed of God, with a mission to regenerate his country, qualified to bring the people into communion with God. To his own nation first of all his labors were due. Therefore he spoke to them of the "nearness or advent of the kingdom of God." The announcement of the kingdom of heaven, was not in itself new; the Old Testament theocracy claimed to represent this kingdom in living reality, — a kingdom in which God himself reigned in present power and majesty, the Holy One in heaven over his chosen people on earth.[1] The declaration of Jesus concerning the Baptist, namely, that the least in the kingdom of heaven was greater than he, shows obviously how little he thought of finding in the Old Testament theocracy the true kingdom of God upon earth. The popular belief in this respect was, in the eyes of Jesus an error, an illusion. In his faith, the kingdom of God was still waiting to be realized. That he was to make it real, in a sense not yet fulfilled, had become to him a certainty. "Change of heart," and faith, he represented as the two indispensable con-

[1] Exodus xix. 5.

ditions of participation in the kingdom of God. The Baptist had also required the first, but in the form of an external obedience to the moral law,—of a benumbing asceticism. This moral onesidedness of the Baptist had its root in a religious defect in his character. He was wanting in an intimate consciousness of God. He had not recognized God as the "Father" of men, as eternal, holy, all-pitying Love. That the customary means of expiation, the sacrificial forms of the old theocracy were not sufficient to bring to the people a renewal of God's grace he clearly saw. Greater efforts, more earnest moral endeavors were necessary in his eyes to appease the righteous wrath of Heaven; in sincere self-abasement the people were to prostrate themselves before the throne of God, and thus to attain to a condition acceptable in His sight. To the Baptist God always appeared as a Lawgiver and Judge. Jesus on the contrary was above all things conscious of God as his "Father,"[1] and at the same time, as the Father of the people. In this consciousness he had already at the Jordan seen heaven open, while to the Baptist it was still closed. The spirit of the Father had descended upon him from above, and an indissoluble bond of union between him and the Eternal was thus formed, and even in the storms and conflicts of temptation, heavenly messengers had not ceased to visit him; communion between his spirit and the invisible world was never for a moment interrupted.[2]

It was therefore a change of mind of an entirely new character that Jesus demanded. Moved as he was to undertake the regeneration of his country by the liv-

[1] Mark i. 11.

[2] Mark i. 13, whose account is to be decidedly preferred to that of Matt. iv. 11.

ing spirit, by that life within which springs in the depth of the human soul from immediate union with God, he necessarily addressed himself directly to the "spirit," the central, personal life of man. Consequently, from the first to the last, no trace is discernible in him of deliberate calculation, of artificial methods, or of the abstractions of the schools. All is alive, original, vigorous in thought and deed. Change of the inmost bent of the mind, not merely of the external conduct, he recognized as the supreme aim of all lasting personal reformation. In place of the old man he would create a new man; in the place of subjection to the animal nature he would establish the supremacy of the spirit; for dependence upon the dead letter, freedom in the service of truth; in the place of appearance, a life fixed in the eternal reality of things. He penetrated directly to the very depths. Nothing less than the highest would satisfy him. He insisted upon a life moulded in one way,—from within. This fundamental fact characterizes his whole Gospel. There was a special appropriateness in the announcement of "glad, good news," with which he began his career. This designation pointedly expressed the new, peculiar, unique character of his work in relation not only to the Old Testament, but also to the Baptist. He had himself come forth from the conflicts with temptation with a mind made glad and penetrated with the consciousness that from him was to proceed a new spiritual age, a divine re-creation of the nations and of human life. To the heaven now always open, to the full fountains of the Eternal Spirit, to uninterrupted communion between the world above and the world here below, he directed all who would hearken to him. The watchword upon his lips was, not bondage, but freedom; not sorrow, but

joy; not division, but reconciliation; not death, but life eternal.

But at the very beginning of his career, with the change of mind required he united the demand for Faith. Trust in God had already been enjoined in the sacred books of the Old Covenant in the most impressive manner and commended in the loftiest terms; but the faith which Jesus made the condition of entrance into the kingdom of God was something far higher. The objects of that Old Testament trust were the historic promises of salvation, the glories of the future of Israel. Whatever of want and tribulation might overwhelm the nation, the pious Israelite was never to cease hoping and waiting for the time,[1] that was coming from the Lord. But it was not to the future that Jesus had reference. All whom he invited were to have faith in a present salvation, which all might experience. It was not (according to the first and third Gospels) his own person that he proposed as the first and last object of the faith which he required, it was not even the Father in heaven. It was in the Gospel actually present that Israel was to believe.[2] Faith was to be reposed in the glad news that heaven was now really open to all, that the Spirit from above had actually descended, that communion with God was now really restored, that a new Israel was to be born. To this announcement the people were to open eye and heart. They were to welcome the new method of salvation which would provide for them new blessings in the future, and to enjoy its announcement without alloy. This glad, childlike, untroubled devotion of the heart to the new spiritual creation from

[1] Isaiah xxviii. 16.

[2] Mark i. 15. The second Evangelist has the earliest account.

above, Jesus named "Faith." Thus he regarded as faith the new state of mind from which the kingdom of God was destined to spring: a living growth. The kingdom thus founded in a change of heart and in faith was thus accredited as an internal kingdom, a kingdom of the Eternal Spirit, independent of the powers of this world. To be the herald of such a kingdom of God was the work chosen at the first by Jesus through searching temptations and severe conflicts. He had come forth, not yet as the Messiah promised by the prophets, but as the founder of a new era, of a new association of pious Israelites in communion with God, independent of theocratic conditions. It had not yet come to him, still less did he design to extend his sphere of action beyond the boundaries of Israel. To rescue a small church of God from the wide political disorder and moral confusion into which his countrymen, mostly through their own fault had fallen, to plant in this little communion the life of the spirit which is from God, to foster and increase this life in it, was at the beginning of his public life the first aim to which he held himself immediately devoted.[1]

NOTE.

[*a*. p. 91. In his account of the sojourn of Jesus in the wilderness and of the temptations which there assailed him, our author appears to me to go far out of the way for his explanations. He does not perceive the very natural and intimate connection between the Baptism and the Temptation. Nothing could be more perfectly in accordance with nature, than that such a season of exaltation as the Baptism, should be followed by a season of depression. Dr. Schenkel begins with referring to the fact that the

[1] See Appendix, III. 5, p. 96.

first three Gospels agree in stating that after his baptism Jesus took up his abode in the wilderness, as if the chief ground for believing this statement rested upon their authority, and not upon the impressive naturalness, the self-evident truth of the history itself. Having deliberately and solemnly committed himself, beyond the possibility of retreat, to a purpose in the execution of which he must sacrifice his life and all that endeared it, how could it be otherwise than that Jesus should become restless? He found it impossible to return to the ordinary relations of life. There came an impulse from within — the spirit, "drove" him away into solitude, there to revolve in his mind his new and revealing experience. A consciousness had been awakened in him, which could not be adjusted to his former familiar and humble sphere: the consciousness of his intimate, filial relation to the Highest. He was here then to do the great work of the Son of God. This was the conviction that had taken possession of his whole soul as never before. He was impelled to go away into solitude to ponder this great thought and all that it involved. For forty days, we are told, he secluded himself from the world. It is not necessary to suppose that his seclusion was absolute, that, during all that time he saw no human face, held no communication with his kindred and friends. It abundantly satisfies the narrative, which is popular and does not aim at precision, to suppose that the space of time — about forty days — was spent by him for the most part by himself, and that only now and then, upon brief and irregular occasions did he see any of his friends, or hold intercourse with the outer world. It is stated, moreover, that he fasted during all that time. And this statement again, the popular character of the narrative, the artless confidence with which it is written, forbids us to accept without qualification. It is not to be taken, nor was it intended to be taken, without abatement. So absorbed was he in thought, that for days together he was so insensible to the wants of the body, and ate so little, that it might be said, in popular speech, that he ate nothing. We have all had experiences that should enable us to understand clearly how it was with him. It is difficult to believe that his kindred had no anxiety on his account, or that they did not carry food to him, of which, however, he probably partook very scantily. His thoughts sustained him. But the time came when this manner of life could not be maintained any longer, when his physical nature began to assert its claims, and he felt the cravings of hunger.

And here comes the account of his temptations, — a passage of the history which has caused the greatest difficulty. It is impossible to take it to the letter. The weakest of human beings could not possibly be tempted by the devil in person. By some, this story is pronounced an allegory or parable, and by others a legend. But all difficulty in discerning the historical truth of this passage vanishes when due weight is given to the consideration, that, as it was the settled belief of the time and the country that evil thoughts were the instigations of an evil spirit who had a personal though invisible existence, — as this was the only idea of temptation and of the origin of evil then entertained, the current modes of speech in relation to this subject were in conformity with this idea. The fact of temptation was always described as it was then universally apprehended. Consequently when Jesus related his severe spiritual experiences in the desert to one or another of his friends, he told them in the way in which all men of that place and time would have told their temptations. He had no thought of intimating, or of being understood as intimating, that the evil one presented himself before him in a visible shape, and addressed him with an audible voice. Nor had those, to whom he related what he had thought and felt when all alone by himself, any idea of so understanding him. They simply understood him as having been tempted just as they themselves were tempted, in like manner, and of course as they thought, by the devil. We all know, when any belief or theory concerning any facts in nature or life has become so widely settled as to have wrought itself into the popular modes of speaking of such facts, that then these popular forms are used without any thought of what they literally express, simply to denote the facts. Thus it was that Jesus used the language of the day, and as he necessarily used these popular and established forms of speech in stating facts, it certainly cannot be denied, neither can it be affirmed, that he believed in the personal existence of an evil spirit, the author of all evil. He spoke of the devil and of demoniacal possession just as we speak of "St. Vitus's dance" and "St. Anthony's fire," using the modes of speaking peculiar to his country and his age, merely, I repeat, to denote facts. The form in which he expressed himself was a matter of prescription and universal usage, and had no vital connection with his personal opinions and convictions.

With this understanding of the case, under an ancient Jewish

costume, is it not easy to discern in the narrative of the Temptation certain facts, pure matters of history, the reality of which is beyond question, because they are in perfect consonance with the laws of human nature and the character of Jesus and his position at the time?

After a while, as I have already observed, his absorbing emotions ceased to sustain him. In the extreme exhaustion of his physical nature, worn down by long fasting, he began to be hungry, to crave food. Recollect, the one lofty conviction of which he had become profoundly conscious, as never before at that exalted moment of self-surrender to the will of the Highest at his baptism, — a conviction that had broken upon him as a revelation, and opened heaven to him, — was a consciousness of oneness with the spirit of all truth and goodness and power, a unity so intimate that it represented itself to him under the relation of parent and child. He was conscious of being no longer his own. He was God's. He was the Son of God. This was the thought that had so filled and overwhelmed him, that under the weight of it his spirit could not rest, but had driven him away from the common haunts of men and plunged him into the solitude of the wilderness, where he might give himself up to this great thought, and consider how he was to bear himself in conformity thereto. And now when the cravings of hunger were becoming importunate, and visions of food began to distract his meditations, as he was wandering alone, lost in thought, his eye glanced upon a stone, which possibly from its shape or color or both, suggested to an imagination affected as his was at the moment by his bodily cravings, the appearance of a loaf of bread. "Since I am the Son of God," he says to himself, "why may I not command these stones to become bread?" The temptation to desecrate the great power of which he had become conscious as the Son of God by devoting it to his mere bodily subsistence, he meets and overcomes with more or less of a struggle. Had the conquest been instant and easy, it would hardly have been worthy of mention. He calls to mind the words of ancient Scripture; "Man does not live by bread alone, but by obedience to the word of God in the soul." The word of God had come to him calling him Son. There is a more sacred life than the life of the body, more nourishing food than that which comes out of the earth. It was not for the sake of this mortal life that he found himself so grandly endowed. Whether immediately afterwards, or after a considerable interval,

he is again wandering in the rocky desert. Absorbed in thought, heedless of his steps, his foot strikes against a stone and he stumbles. Perhaps he is in danger of a serious fall. Instantly there occurs to him another passage of Scripture: "He will give his angels charge over thee, to keep thee in all thy ways, lest at any time thou dash thy foot *against a stone*." So suggestive to his mind was everything that he looked upon, that it is natural to conjecture that it was in this way that the second temptation arose. It is at all events curious to observe, that in both these first two temptations, there is mention made of *stones*. Instantly it occurs to him that since he has angels attending him at every step saving him from the slightest hurt, why may he not go to the city, the great city of Jerusalem, and ascend one of the pinnacles of the temple and cast himself off, and display to the astonished crowd below his power of securing his own safety by means of these invisible attendants. This temptation also he overcomes, again after a struggle with himself more or less protracted. It would be putting God to a trial. It would be challenging the divine power to show itself in a case where no end was to be gained but the gratification of a vainglorious desire. Once more in his wanderings he finds himself upon an eminence, which commands a view so extensive that it awakens in him a corresponding consciousness of power, and as a vision of the magnitude of the world and its multitudinous nations rises before him, he feels the stirring of personal ambition, and bethinks him how, if he would only fall down and worship the evil thought, he might possess himself of universal dominion. How alluring this temptation was is evident from the vehemence with which he repels it: "Get thee behind me, Satan!" is his exclamation, "Thou shalt worship the Lord thy God, and him only shalt thou serve!" These last words Jesus addressed to himself. The tempter and the temptation were within in his own soul. As in the wilderness at the first, so at the last in the garden Jesus underwent severe internal conflicts. In both cases it is stated that angels ministered to him. The exalting sense of new strength consequent upon his moral victories, doubtless seemed to him as if communicated by angelic agency, and was naturally so described that his language was taken in its literal sense by such as had no similar experience of their own to interpret it for them.

Dr. Schenkel's idea, as we may gather it from this chapter,

appears to be that Jesus went to John not so much on his own account as to discover what the Baptist was accomplishing, that he gained insight upon this visit into the condition and wants of the people, and into the defectiveness and incompetency of John's method of reform, and that he consequently retired into the desert to consider what course he himself should pursue, and the result was the resolve to devote himself to the establishment of a kingdom, not of outward forms, but of the spirit, founded upon faith and change of heart.

This view strikes me as altogether too artificial. It lacks the force of nature. It overlooks, moreover, those impressive manifestations of the laws of the human spirit, which I have just now endeavored to point out. It represents the "kingdom of God," announced by John first and then by Jesus, as if it were a scheme that had its origin in the mind of Jesus. Now the more I have studied the utterances of Jesus concerning the kingdom of heaven, the clearer it has become to me that what he so designated and discoursed about as a heavenly kingdom was no private plan or vision of his own, but what, with an insight of unparalleled depth and clearness, he saw already and from the beginning existing in the nature of things and upon the eve of being more fully developed. What are his parables about the kingdom of heaven, but so many pictures of the moral laws, of the spirit and order of the Eternal Providence, in a word, of the moral government of the world? As I have already remarked, the kingdom of heaven, in the mind of Jesus, was not a personal scheme but a fact in history and in the human soul, — a fact which the approaching downfall of the Jewish nation was to bring forth into greater prominence. Had it been a peculiar idea of his own, would he not have been prompted to take greater pains to organize it? He treated it as if it were already organized in nature, in fact, in the human soul. He had no need to provide it with forms. He had only to breathe abroad its spirit. And in reality he advanced the kingdom of heaven among men, — did more, in other words, to bring men into harmony and submission to the government of God by his unconscious influence, by his *being*, than by anything he said or did, great as his acts and sayings were. — TRANS.]

CHAPTER V.

THE CALLING OF THE DISCIPLES AND THE FIRST RESULTS.

1. The first public action of Jesus then was directed to the establishment of the Kingdom of God in Israel; his desire was to gather a company of genuine Israelites. To this end there was needed above all things a strong nucleus of men of a like spirit with his own, who would stand by him as fellow-laborers, upon whom he could implicitly rely, and who would render him a hearty support in his endeavors. He sought and found them, not in the learned circles, and least of all among the more cultivated and distinguished. As he had himself come forth from the people, so it appeared to him that the persons, best fitted to help on the renovation of Israel which he had begun, were men of the people, simple-hearted, unschooled, unspoiled by the narrow and artificial culture of the time. It was among the humble circles of the middle orders of the people, around the Lake of Gennesaret, that he commenced his labors. That region was settled mostly by families who supported themselves by the trade of fishing. It was among these people that he found a surprisingly favorable reception. Under the influence of a delightful natural scenery and a mild sky, in the shade of the palm, the olive, the vine, and the fig-tree, with simple manners and moderate demands upon the enjoyments of life, the people it appears had remained more childlike; the air in that mountainous country was pure, the water clear, the lake peaceful, inviting to dreamy meditation. This

region Jesus made the centre of his activity. He left his home in Nazareth, where perhaps his humble birth was an obstacle to his influence,[1] and took up his abode at Capernaum on the western shore of the lake. Here his first pupils joined him. As he did not commence his public career until after the arrest of the Baptist, there was no reason why he should have gathered round him a circle of fellow-laborers any earlier. How could he have thought of seeking out disciples immediately after his baptism, far as he was from Galilee and without any relations to the country or the people? How could he instruct and guide others before he had himself passed victoriously through severe internal conflicts? That the calling of the disciples, therefore, took place immediately after his baptism, according to the fourth Gospel, and that the Baptist himself, as the same Gospel states,[2] directed his own followers to Jesus, is contrary to all historical probability.[3] This account of the formation of the first company of disciples was possible only from the stand-point of a Gospel according to which Jesus never had to undergo the temptations and conflicts which were essential to the unfolding of his character, and the Baptist was never less than the least in the kingdom of Jesus but rather the most eminent and enlightened member of the heavenly kingdom, being the first to understand most fully the mystery of the reconciliation effected by the blood of Jesus and to recognize his divine sonship. As, according to the fourth Gospel, Jesus knew no spiritual growth but was perfect from the first, so likewise

[1] Mark ii. 1; vi. 3; Matt. ix. 1; xiii. 54; Luke iv. 24.

[2] John i. 35.

[3] See Appendix, Ill. 6, p. 103.

Andrew, Simon, Philip, Nathanael, (Bartholomew?) were not drawn to him gradually but became his disciples at once. Jesus had seen Simon only once, when this Gospel states that he recognized him as "the Rock," and gave him the name of "Cephas";[1] upon the first meeting with Jesus, Andrew is convinced that he has found the Messiah;[2] Philip communicates the same discovery to Nathaniel;[3] Nathaniel indeed hesitates, but Jesus reveals himself by a miracle of Omniscience, and then in spite of his still expressed doubt Nathaniel suddenly sees in Jesus, the "Son of God," the "King of Israel."[4] In a similar way Jesus himself, apparently by a miracle of Almighty power, is transported at once from Judea, the country about Jordan, to Cana in Galilee.[5]

In this representation we seek in vain for the connecting threads of historical consistency. There is one idea upon which this account is constructed, the idea of the majesty of the Son of God, the chosen organ of the eternal "Logos." It is his superhuman greatness and Messianic dignity which is instantly and by a supernatural influence recognized by the Baptist and the disciples, and by which the latter become at once (and consequently by no human means) what they were to be. It is in this light — in the light of those great spiritual effects, which the Gospel in the seventy or eighty years subsequent to the evangelical events had wrought — that the fourth Gospel views those events; but whoever desires to see them in the simple light of history is referred to the first three Gospels.

2. Upon his early withdrawal from Nazareth,[6] Jesus

[1] John i. 42. [2] John i. 41. [3] John i. 46.
[4] John i. 49. [5] John ii. 1. [6] See App., III. 7, p. 104.

took up his abode in Capernaum.[1] He had begun speaking publicly to small numbers. Soon the attention of the better disposed was fixed upon him, and he felt the need of strengthening himself in his work by efficient forces drawn from the people. Wandering by himself on the shores of the lake he met two pairs of brothers, Andrew and Simon, James and John. These brothers, doubtless, had already heard him several times speaking of the coming kingdom of God. His warning words in regard to the necessity of an entire heart-change and of faith in the need of a new moral centre and germ in the corrupt masses, had already kindled in their bosoms the desire for intimate, vital communion with him. Without any clear knowledge of what would benefit the people, they nevertheless felt a deeper and more earnest longing for salvation. They were all fishermen by trade; some of them had just been engaged in fishing, the others were setting their boat in order. They all resolved to join Jesus, thenceforth to live with him and devote themselves to the service of the kingdom, but without at once wholly forsaking their old pursuits.

The first condition which Jesus made obligatory upon them was obedience to his directions. They were to follow him. All that had previously occupied their lives — their boats, their nets, their fishing utensils, their daily labor for their daily bread — were no longer to be their chief concern; they were thenceforth to put themselves under the higher authority of God; at all events, they were to hold themselves ready at any moment to separate themselves from their nearest domestic relations. But it was a per-

[1] Mark i. 21; Matt. iv. 13.

fectly free obedience that Jesus required. He did not practise upon his young friends any bribing arts of persuasion nor overpower them with signs and wonders. He indicated with striking brevity the high calling to which he summoned them: "I will make you fishers of men."[1] He compared his Gospel to a net thrown out, first among the people of Israel; he disclaimed the idea of winning all; only a draught was to be made, there was to be a gathering made, and an "election." Without using any arts, without violence, only by the free influence of the word of truth and the spirit of love, were men to be allured by them into the net of the kingdom. In what calm greatness does the character of Jesus appear in the forming of this first circle of his disciples, consisting of the small number of four only!

How homely this beginning, humanly regarded, but how pure! How free from all alloy of self-seeking, of ambition, of love of power! The word of truth instantly impresses simple, childlike, truth-loving natures; unperverted as they are, it acts upon them at once. Here is, by the way, the secret of the ceaseless, eternal influence of Christianity. But how hard it was to understand this influence is shown in the way in which the later evangelical tradition represents the first calling of the disciples.[2] While the extraordinary influence of Jesus over those whom he called was shown in his binding them to him by his word, according to the later tradition it was not his word but a miracle which won for him his first disciples. He is represented as having recourse to a draught of fishes that yielded a miraculous supply, whereat Peter and they that were with him were thrown into a state

[1] Mark i. 17; Matt. iv. 19. [2] Luke v. 1–11.

of great excitement, and, at the word of the Lord that they should be fishers of men, they joined themselves to him with James and John. Connected with such an incident, the word that made their hearts burn loses all value ; instead of being the vital force of the call, it is only the outer shell. It was not a moral awakening, but a magical surprise that in this case drew the disciples to Jesus. And besides, this supernatural relation presupposes a point of view which plainly betrays its later origin. That full draught of fishes, which, by its magnitude, exposed the boat to the danger of sinking,[1] had a deep significance at a time when the fulness of the Gentiles was gathered into the net of the Gospel, but it had not the same meaning when Jesus first appeared as a teacher with only four disciples at the Lake of Gennesaret. This miraculous story would fain represent beforehand the spread of the Gospel in the heathen world.

In order rightly to appreciate the work of Jesus at its first beginning, it must not be overlooked that it was by the Word that his first successes were won, by the Word that liberated men from the bondage of the letter and the statute: the Word of faith in the eternal kingdom of the spirit, and in the establishment of that kingdom in the life of the people. The later tradition evidently no longer clearly recognized the significance of the Word of Jesus. According to the fourth Gospel, Jesus began his career in Galilee with a most astonishing miracle, the changing of water into wine at Cana,[2] in order to reveal to the people his divine glory. It was in conformity to the ideas entertained at a later period of the person of Jesus, to think of his career as beginning thus, but it is not in keep-

[1] Luke v. 7. [2] John ii. 1.

ing with his spirit and character. By a miracle, such as is related in the fourth Gospel, he might have excited ignorant wonder and tumultuous admiration, but he would hardly have opened and won the hearts of men to the unseen and silently growing kingdom of the spirit.

At the first, Jesus entered upon his labors as a teacher only in very small circles of friends. Strengthened by the two pairs of brothers, he commenced his public work in the synagogue in Capernaum. There were valid reasons why he held himself aloof from the temple service and attended the synagogue. The temple worship was the central pulsation of the theocracy; the synagogue had in it the elements of a reform of Judaism. As it had its origin in a time of national suffering and exile, its services, its prayers, and hymns kept the people in remembrance that God seeks to be called upon in the time of trouble. In the synagogue the people were represented, they took part in the service. A council of elders were their representatives, prefiguring the Christian Church. The synagogue gave Jesus the opportunity of impressing not only the people but the ministers of Judaism also. Besides, Jesus entered the synagogue, not as the Messiah, not even as an officer of the synagogue, but as a teacher of the Law (Rabbi) and free expounder of the Holy Scriptures of the Old Covenant. The difference between him and the established teachers in his mode of teaching made itself at once observable to all. He taught "as one having authority,"[1] not merely as a gifted speaker, brilliant in rhetorical arts, but as one conscious of a mission and of qualifications coming not from men but from God.

[1] Mark i. 22; Luke iv. 32.

Hence, the astonishment of his hearers at his first appearance as a teacher was not stupid wonder but a glad surprise, for there flowed from his lips the power of a divine spirit, the breath of a new life was felt through the whole assembly.

3. On the Sabbath on which Jesus began his career as a teacher in the synagogue in Capernaum, an incident occurred which throws a significant light upon his peculiar work and character. Among his hearers was a man whose mind was diseased — such is to be understood as the case of "the man with an unclean spirit"[1] whom the demon "threw in the midst."[2] This person, it would seem, was suffering from religious mania. Greatly excited by the speaking of Jesus, he looked upon him as a dangerous being of a higher order, and it was this insane fancy that induced Jesus to address him directly. Jesus succeeded in composing and restoring him. The impression produced by this act deepened still more in all present the effect of his word.

It is not to be questioned that we here confront an enigmatical aspect of the public activity of Jesus. In the synagogue in Capernaum he wrought the first miracle; but the miracles which the Gospels ascribe to Jesus place the evangelical history in the eyes of many in a dubious and uncertain light. There is a theory of miracles, which, in relation to Jesus, renders an historical representation of his character impossible. If, for example, we consider the miracle-working gift of Jesus as an efflux of Almighty power dwelling in him, or as a beaming forth of his "divine nature," then by no human standard is his conduct to be measured; and then there is only one circumstance

[1] Mark i. 26. [2] Luke iv. 35.

wonderful, and that is, that, with his miraculous working, he was on other occasions wholly natural, and bore himself, like any other man, as within the limits prescribed by natural laws. Hence, from an historical point of view the wonder-working power of Jesus can be apprehended only in so far as it admits of being understood as a truly human gift. Were he possessed of a power which was in contradiction with natural human ability, then we must give over the idea of representing it to ourselves. It is, therefore, as a natural, human gift that we regard his power, extraordinary as it may be.

That upon his first public appearance in the synagogue in Capernaum, he actually, in a way that astonished all present, healed a person mentally diseased, is not to be doubted. He must consequently have been possessed of an extraordinary ability to impress beneficently persons of this description and to relieve them, as is shown also by similar effects produced on sufferers of this class. Even though the results produced be fabulously exaggerated, and even though, according to an opinion universally prevalent among the Jews, mental diseases, insanity, epilepsy and the like, were attributed to demoniacal possession, or the preternatural occupation of human beings by evil spirits, yet the fact remains unshaken, that Jesus cured a large number of persons thus afflicted. How he himself stood in relation to the popular ideas of the time concerning possession can never be determined.[1] Undoubtedly, he did not consider it any business of his to correct this superstition. His work was a different one: to help the suffering portion of the people, to renew them inwardly, and this mission

[1] See Appendix, III. 8, p. 110.

he fulfilled in Capernaum. Insanity is one of the most fearful disorders of human nature. That it was so regarded is seen in the popular belief that it was caused by an immediate influence coming from an invisible world of malignant spirits. Jesus himself, perfectly sound in body and in mind, was conscious of the power to combat this disorder, and liberate diseased minds from their chains. This work came all the more in his way, as the striking frequency of mental disorders at that period was in accordance with the peculiar state of the times. Insanity is always a concomitant of great popular excitements, startling events and revolutionary commotions. In the ordinary course of human affairs the equilibrium of moral and spiritual life is in much less danger of being lost than in seasons of revolution when the old and the new, as yet unadjusted, are in a state of wild ferment contending for settlement. The disturbed condition of the moral and religious relations of the time will explain to us the numerous cases of mental disease, which the first three Gospels represent as cases of "possession." Hence also the extraordinary interest which these unfortunate persons showed in Jesus. Hence the earnest and effective sympathy which he gave them.

4. But now how was it, that Jesus cured the maniac in the synagogue in Capernaum? We have no evidence that the man was permanently cured. Jesus, however, as the narrative states, stayed the paroxysm by his word, by means purely moral and spiritual; the Evangelist attributes the result to the word, to the "new teaching."[1] Not as a magician does Jesus appear here, exorcising evil spirits by a formula of adjuration, but as a mighty teacher of truth, who has found

[1] Mark i. 27.

the word that gives moral and spiritual freedom, — the word that composes the disturbed mind, makes sound again the diseased soul. The conviction flashes upon the assembly that here is the man who can help the people in their extreme need.

In the dwelling of Simon, whither Jesus went from the synagogue, a second occasion was offered for his power of healing by the mother-in-law of Simon. The later accounts represent her as *very* sick; on this point the second Gospel tells us nothing.[1] In this instance likewise, it was the composing influence of the personal presence of Jesus, his taking the sick woman kindly by the hand with soothing and cheering words, whereby she was made well. A similar moral power over those whose nervous system is in a disturbed state is possessed by every one. A person nervously excited excites others who are in a similar condition, while one who is morally and spiritually sound, possesses in himself a power by which he creates in others a sense of returning health. There are persons, in whose mere neighborhood we feel uncomfortable, physically unwell, whose presence affects and disturbs us. On the other hand, there are those whose presence enlivens us, exhilarates the whole nervous system. Such influences do not admit of being explained by any ordinary "physical" laws; they have a psychological or spiritual character. The invisible sphere of the human spirit is wondrous, not to be measured. In its normal and eternal essence the soul is altogether incomprehensible. A depth, revealed only in part to man himself, exists in the centre of every human life. Who can say: "I have fathomed myself to the very inmost of my being. I know how to trace back all my

[1] Matt. viii. 14; Luke iv. 38; Mark i. 30.

thoughts, volitions, actions, to their ultimate causes, or, looking back over a course of years I am to myself perfectly clear, I have known myself fully"? Self-knowledge is indeed a gift, but we can never wholly compass it. In view of such considerations, it is not irreconcilable with the nature of the human spirit that Jesus by his spiritual power produced on other minds effects, which manifested themselves physically, effects seemingly inexplicable. Modern philosophy, the more clearly it recognizes the intimate union of the material and immaterial in man, will be the less disposed to account such effects impossible. We must take care, on the other hand, that we do not lose sight of their conditions, and place them on a level with the effects of Divine Omnipotence. They are, after all, effects produced only by the personal power of man: effects that, like all proceeding from that source, depend upon moral means, presuppose a corresponding susceptibility in those upon whom they were wrought, and are limited in extent. When the maniac was to be relieved, it was necessary that he should acknowledge the superior personality of Jesus, and submit to his authority. When the mother-in-law of Simon was to be freed from her fever, she must confide in Jesus, and taking his hand reliantly raise herself up. And not at all times, not in every place, not in regard to every person did Jesus equally feel his power and the same confidence in his ability to compose and heal the suffering.[1] A spiritual intercommunication was the indispensable condition of every cure.

But it was not from this calm and free point of view that these two extraordinary cures were re-

[1] Compare Mark vi. 5; Matt. xii. 38.

garded by the people of Capernaum, among whom the rumor of them spread with lightning rapidity. The multitude saw in Jesus only the wonderful man who had vanquished the hostile powers of the demon world. A few hours after these occurrences towards sunset, there arose an extraordinary stir among the people, unemployed as they were, it being the Sabbath. Numerous sick persons were brought to the house of Simon. The door was besieged by them; Jesus was taken by storm. The number brought to him was not small. That he immediately cured them "all" is the statement of the later tradition. An earlier account states only that "many" were healed:[1] a significant fact, tending to confirm the idea that the cure of the sick depended upon their moral susceptibility, and that on this occasion, only such were curable by Jesus as were diseased through a disturbed spiritual condition, upon whom, therefore, according to the nature of the case, a moral and spiritual influence could take effect.

NOTE.

[WRITERS and speakers, unskilled in the arts of language and possessed of only a very limited vocabulary, naturally fall into a dramatic style of narration. They tell things in the way that addresses itself most vividly to the apprehensions of their readers or hearers. The Gospels show themselves to be the work of writers of this class. Their mode of narration is throughout scenic. The account they give of the calling of the first four disciples and of Matthew is of this character, and in accepting it we must make allowance for this peculiarity: "And Jesus, walking by the Sea of Galilee, saw two brothers, Simon called Peter, and Andrew his brother, casting a net into the sea; for they were fishers. And he says to them, Follow me, and I will make you fishers of men.

[1] Mark i. 34.

And they straightway left their nets and followed him." This statement seems at first sight to partake somewhat of the miraculous. But this appearance vanishes when we make allowance for the dramatic form of narration characteristic of writers having no skill in the art of composition. The same thing would have been told by a more practised hand somewhat after this manner: "Upon the shores of the Sea of Galilee, where he was wont to walk, Jesus made the acquaintance of two brothers, Simon afterwards called Peter, and his brother Andrew, and he induced them to leave their trade of fishing and accompany him, promising them he would teach them to catch not fish but men."

In accepting as things that actually took place the immediate relief given by Jesus to the possessed man in the synagogue and to Simon's mother-in-law, Professor Schenkel finds but little difficulty, but he would have found still less, had he taken into consideration the powerful effect produced upon the people by the personal presence and manner of Jesus. It was not merely what he said, but the way in which he said it, the singular tone of authority with which he spoke, unlike everything the people were accustomed to, — this it was that moved the people so deeply that they acted and reacted upon one another, and individuals were excited first by the words, tones, and looks of Jesus, and then again by the excited crowd around them. We all know the mysterious, magnetic power of sympathy, and how it lifts a man out of himself and transports him into a new condition of being, in which he becomes susceptible of new and strange influences. How powerfully the crowd in the synagogue were excited by the appearance and teaching of Jesus is shown by the outcry of the possessed man. This person when he went into the synagogue was probably calm, silent, and sane. But the commanding presence of Jesus and the excited assembly around him affected the man so powerfully, threw him into a state of such nervous agitation that he could not restrain himself. And conscious of his inability to command himself, his old insane idea that evil spirits had possession of him gained the mastery, and he cried out accordingly, giving expression to the admiring awe with which Jesus had inspired him, and in which we may well suppose the whole assembly more or less fully shared. Thus the sudden access of his disease as well as its subsequent cure bears witness to the power of Jesus on this occasion. One can

readily imagine the sensation caused by this sudden and startling interruption. Some, doubtless, were for laying violent hands upon the maniac and hurrying him from the place, the decorum of which he had so grossly violated. Amidst the confusion, Jesus, alone calm and self-possessed, in the full consciousness of his great personal force, addressed the man, and in commanding tones, using the only mode of speaking then known in reference to such cases, bade the evil spirits quit the man and let him alone. Whereupon the man, upon being thus directly spoken to by the person who had inspired him with such awful reverence, fell down in a convulsion, — the spirit "tore" him, it is said, — and in a few moments the paroxysm passed off and he became calm and himself again. Can we not here also easily imagine the sensation which this incident must have produced in the already greatly excited assembly. The people, as the record states, "were all amazed, insomuch that they questioned among themselves, saying, "What thing is this? What new kind of teaching is this?" He not only moves us as we were never moved before, but "he exercises authority over unclean spirits and they obey him!" The report of this occurrence instantly spread through the whole neighborhood and place, everywhere kindling curiosity and wonder into a flame.

Upon leaving the synagogue, Jesus went with his four friends to Simon's house. Doubtless there were other persons, relatives and friends, in the house, and all was excitement. The mother-in-law of Simon was lying ill, not very ill, as Professor Schenkel justly surmises from Mark's account. The story of what had occurred in the synagogue was, in all probability, told to the sick woman with looks, and tones, and manner that communicated to her the universal excitement. After a while Jesus went to her bedside, but it needed no miraculous power to stimulate her vital forces. Wonder and awe must have done that. So animating was his mere presence, his gracious looks and words, that she felt herself so much better that she arose and instantly busied herself in preparing refreshments for the company.

What followed is strikingly told in the next chapter by our author, who well represents Jesus as having been taken by surprise when a crowd of lunatics and other diseased persons gathered round the house "at sunset" clamorous to be cured.

These incidents, the case of the insane man in the synagogue and that of Simon's mother-in-law, tended mightily, in addition to

the commanding air that characterized Jesus, to deepen the sensation he was producing and extend the fame of him. There naturally went immediately abroad an almost unlimited faith among the simple-minded people in his power of healing, and it was ascribed by them, I doubt not, to the extraordinary sanctity of his character. That he was actually possessed of a peculiar gift I see no reason to question but strong reason to believe. But in what it specially consisted, whether it were a singular gift, or the consequence and manifestation of his unparalleled moral and personal force, I cannot tell. Whichever it was, the wonderful greatness of his character remains the same. It is evident that the people believed that the reason why he was so powerful was that he was so good. There was, therefore, at the foundation of their faith in him a moral element, and their faith in him was faith in truth and goodness. Have we not here one obvious reason why he attached a religious value to faith? — TRANS.]

CHAPTER VI.

EXTENDED ACTIVITY.

1. THE work of Jesus was confined at the first, in Capernaum and its immediate vicinity, to the announcing of the Kingdom of God as a free moral and religious association founded on a change of mind and on faith, and to the healing of certain persons afflicted with mental diseases. But the first result appears to have made a deep impression upon his mind. It was not the result which he had desired or aimed to produce. This tumultous flocking together of the people, this crowd of the diseased and suffering, this stormy demand for instant healing, — at once startled and saddened him. His design was to establish an invisible kingdom of Faith and of new hearts. How could it escape his searching sight that it was mainly by super-

ficial and self-seeking motives that most of his admirers were attracted to him? True, it was the miserable, oppressed, tormented among the people, who sought his help, but generally they had only a very faint idea of their misery. The hidden causes of their wretched condition, their sins and neglected duties, they did not recognize; they cared only to be relieved from their physical sufferings, delivered from their worldly burthens.

Jesus did not refuse them his assistance. He might even hope that relief from their outward disorders might awaken in them a longing for deliverance from inward destitution. But this reflection did not wholly allay his disquietude. The night that followed that eventful Sabbath-day, brought rest neither to his body nor his mind. The day had not dawned, as the second Evangelist with the fresh unfaded coloring of an original narrative relates,[1] when Jesus left his couch, in order to quit not merely the city of Capernaum, but especially the scene of the events of the day before. He breaks away from men and their pursuits, and seeks the quiet of solitude, there to collect himself by prayer. That he was followed to the place of retreat, as Luke relates,[2] by the multitude is not probable; they had dispersed the evening before.

Why did Jesus thus take to flight in this surprising way? In the first place, to escape the painful pressure and importunity of the people, but especially for the purpose of withdrawing himself from a mode of life, which he could not look upon as in consonance with his aims. His disciples thought otherwise. All four (the number was not yet any larger) set out, and did

[1] Compare Mark i. 35 with the less fresh statement of Luke iv. 42.
[2] Luke iv. 42.

not rest till they had found their master. To them his flight was inexplicable. For why should he withdraw from the admiration, and applause, and gratitude of so many who needed or who had received his help? And moreover in the early morning after Jesus had quitted Capernaum, new applicants for his help had appeared, as the disciples felt bound to tell their master.

Jesus doubtless left Capernaum thus suddenly before dawn, that he might not be forced against his true destination to enter upon a wrong path. This temptation beset him several times at the outset of his career. He was exposed to the danger of using his gifts in a way inconsistent with the work to which Heaven had called him, and consequently injurious to it. But against this temptation the essential soundness of his character had protected him: his perfect humility before God and before man. Without such simplicity of heart he would hardly have been able to resist it. How many sophisms has the mind ready in such cases when it is blinded by vanity! With how much plausibility might he have persuaded himself, that his power of healing must be made an inexhaustible source of good for mankind, and therefore should be regarded as his chief instrument! Such was without doubt the thought of his disciples. They would fain have brought him back to Capernaum, that he might perform still more wonderful cures. The sick who were waiting for him, were ready to receive him with acclamations, but all the more resolutely did he refuse to yield to the pressure. He held it his duty for the present to avoid Capernaum entirely, and devote himself to his true and peculiar work. Not to heal bodily diseases, but to announce and extend the Kingdom of God, was the task for which he had been endowed with the richest

gifts. "Let us go into the neighboring towns," said he, "that I may preach there likewise, for therefore I came forth." Thus he silenced his disciples. The establishment of God's kingdom through a living, free, public announcement of salvation, he thenceforth made the highest, and in a certain sense his sole aim.

2. In consequence of the painful experience he had had, Jesus withdrew himself at once and entirely from the solicitations of those who sought his healing help, and for some time used his peculiar power only when it was mental health that was to be restored,[1] which is the reason why the healing of a leper appeared to the Evangelist a remarkable event.[2] And it is so because Jesus thus wrought a new kind of cure, which in the method employed by him presents greater difficulties than the previous cases. The exact particulars of this new cure it is no longer possible to ascertain. There could hardly have been any eyewitness present on the occasion, as before they were legally certified to be cured, lepers were not allowed to be seen in the neighborhood of human dwellings. An influence purely spiritual, exercised upon a person suffering with leprosy, is certainly not as easy to be conceived of as the same influence in the case of the mentally diseased. The leper was probably substantially cured when he came to Jesus. At all events, the fact that he went into the house where Jesus was, implies that he was not in the worst stage of the disease.[3] How else would he have ventured without meeting a serious repulse to enter a human dwelling?[4] It is subsequently evident that Jesus consented very reluctantly to work a cure.

[1] Mark i. 39; Luke iv. 43, says nothing of cures.
[2] Mark i. 40; Matt. viii. 1; Luke v. 12.
[3] Mark i. 43.
[4] See App., Ill. 9, p. 120.

Even in this case the cure was effected by moral means. It was the confidence of the sufferer that first awoke in the bosom of Jesus the loving pity that was powerful to heal;[1] but at the same time, Jesus was already firmly resolved to avoid all further applications of the kind. Hence the earnest injunction laid upon the man to tell no one how he had been cured. When the man, however, bruited it abroad, and the first scenes in Capernaum were repeated, Jesus instantly determined to resist with all his power what was so repugnant to him, this flocking of the people to him, seeking to be cured. His disinclination to be any further beset in this way amounted in him even to indignation at the proposed misuse of his gifts. According to the earlier tradition (the later tradition for obvious reasons is silent upon this circumstance) he addressed the leper after his cure in severe terms and drove him away.[2] A truly human trait most certainly, but not consonant with the ideas of a later period. It shows that Jesus did not look upon such cures as appropriate proofs of his true mission, even though they proceeded from a heart beating in sympathy with suffering men. He regarded them as temptations rather besetting his path, which he often felt it his duty to avoid. In rare instances only do the persons healed appear to have become the subjects of spiritual enlightenment and true conversion.

One thing in particular in the account of the cure of the leper deserves to be noticed. Jesus directed him, according to the usual custom,[3] to show himself to the priest, and make the purification offering "for a testimony unto them,"[4] i. e. to the people, to whom

[1] Mark i. 41.
[2] Mark i. 43.
[3] Leviticus xiv. 1.
[4] Mark i. 44.

the method of his cure would remain unknown. In all probability the words "for a testimony to them" were not uttered by Jesus, but were added by the narrator in order to explain the remarkable direction given to the leper by Jesus in the interest of a strict observance of the Old Testament statute. But how could Jesus have been moved thus to refer to the Law? As it seems to us, considerable light is here thrown upon the gradual development of his views. He had at that time unquestionably become clearly conscious of his mission to form a free Communion, sanctified in God, of true, spiritually-minded men; but as to his position in regard to the theocratic system he had not yet arrived at any strong conviction. It still lay in his design to avoid putting himself in hostility to the ecclesiastical authorities, the priesthood, and high council at Jerusalem; he had no desire to expose himself to the appearance of transgressing the existing statutes. For his own part, he, from whom the "new teaching" of the kingdom of God proceeded, had then indeed no doubt that communion of the spirit and heart with God was not dependent upon ceremonial observances; but the Law, the religious formula handed down from the fathers, was still regarded by him as the outward inviolable order. He was as yet by no means certain that he should be compelled openly to break with it. (*a*)

3. An incident that occurred in Capernaum soon after the cure of the leper appears to have been the first occasion for his changing his position towards the theocracy. From his circuit through the Galilean towns and villages he had come back to Capernaum. He might reasonably have had some hope that the excitement caused by his teaching and healing there had

been allayed. This does not appear, however, to have been the case. Of his course abroad such reports had reached Capernaum that his return was looked for with the most excited expectation. Scarcely had the news spread of his arrival when a crowd gathered round the door of the house where he was. Apparently he did not satisfy their expectations; he healed none, but only preached the "word" of the kingdom.[1] When, notwithstanding his indisposition to gratify their desire to be cured of their bodily diseases, he after a while wrought a cure, it was under peculiar circumstances. A paralytic was brought to him, and the eagerness shown and the pains taken by the four men, who brought him, are truly touching. The older tradition, in aiming to render the scene vivid, has portrayed it to its minutest particulars. An entrance by the door was impossible on account of the dense crowd; in order to find way for the four men to carry the sufferer into the room where Jesus was, the roof of the house was removed.

In this instance Jesus adopted a new method. Hitherto he had cured the sick who came to him without any special regard to their previous moral condition. It had sufficed him if they had a general susceptibility to his influence, confidence in his power to relieve them. And he had had many melancholy experiences in such cases; the persons whom he had cured had, generally speaking, evinced little or no sense of his higher purposes, of the Kingdom of God which he announced. He had gladly escaped from the clamorous crowd. The applause, the admiration, the thronging of the people around him had only filled him with sadness. In the stillness of solitude he had

[1] Mark ii. 2.

fortified himself by prayer against the temptation that would allure him away from homely labor in the service of the divine kingdom to those works which filled the world with wonder. The coarseness, selfishness, impatience of pain, and ingratitude of men, were seen by him in solitude in all their deformity as never before. The individuals cured by him had mostly disappeared again. His admonitions and warnings had made no impression. The leper had at least promised silence, and, hardly out of sight of Jesus, had broken his promise. At the Jordan Jesus had seen heaven open; it had announced peace, reconciliation of sinful men with God, and the consolations of life eternal. But every day it became more and more apparent what it was that especially prevented men from putting faith in his work of peace and from entering into the new Covenant of the Divine Communion. Sin stood like a wall between them and the merciful God: the low, selfish mind, the greed of gain and pleasure, anxiety to avoid suffering, with no dread of the guilt which is the source of suffering.

In consequence of such melancholy experience, Jesus had grown cautious as to whom he would cure; and now, of those who gathered around him seeking help, he resolved to heal only this man, who, by the pains which he took to reach him, gave positive evidence of a deeper faith. He perceived that the moral condition of the sufferer was such as to qualify him for the divine kingdom. When Jesus said to him, "Thy sins are forgiven thee," he not only reminded him that sin is the worst disease of man, but also that it was his own highest mission to deliver men from sin. Bodily healing, from this point of view, was shown to be only a symbol of moral and religious restoration.[1]

[1] Mark ii. 17; Matt. ix. 12; Luke v. 31.

4. But now on this same occasion an incident occurred that had weighty consequences. For the first time Jesus came in collision with the Scribes, the ministers of the popular Jewish theology, to whom his teaching had rendered him an object of suspicion, and his influence with the people had made him odious. Partly from curiosity and partly with the hope of checking his career and finding cause for a criminal prosecution of this "Innovator" and disturber of the peace from Nazareth, certain Scribes had entered the house with the crowd and got into the immediate presence of Jesus.[1] When he told the paralytic that his sins were forgiven, they imagined that they had found ground of complaint against him. In view of the high favor in which he stood with the people, they did not venture to speak out and express their indignation on the spot, but they showed by their looks and their whole manner what they thought, and Jesus had no difficulty in perceiving what was in their minds. It was not altogether from malice that they were excited against him. As they believed that God alone can forgive sins, the declaration of Jesus absolving the man from his sins sounded to them as an arrogant self-deification, a blasphemy of the Holy One, deserving of punishment. All the more for its not being formally expressed did Jesus feel bound to vindicate himself against so grave a charge; and he did so in a very peculiar way. He claimed no divine authority, but so designated himself as to emphasize his purely human personality. He named himself "the Son of Man."[2] For the first time and unquestionably with reference to the Jewish theologues present he so called himself. What significance had this designation in his mouth?

[1] Mark ii. 16. [2] Mark ii. 10; Matt. ix. 6; Luke v. 24.

He certainly did not intend by it, according to the common supposition, to declare himself the Messiah. Had such been his intention, he surely would have chosen no ambiguous title.[1] He certainly would not have revealed to his bitter opponents the secret of his mission which he had not yet communicated to his most intimate friends. The title "Son of Man" was not by any means new; it frequently occurs in the scriptures of the Old Covenant. It is the title by which the prophet Ezekiel is addressed by God.[2] In the book of Daniel the Messianic people appears, in the spirit of the Maccabean period, to be thus designated. That Jesus assumed this title in the sense of the book of Daniel is not probable, because "the Son of Man" of that book has little correspondence with the personal qualities of Jesus. The Son of Man in Daniel is not described as a teacher of humble origin, a simple man of the people; he does not show his power in the forgiveness of sins; he is invested with heavenly honors, the possessor of a higher power, called to reign over all the nations of the earth. Only in opposition to this idea of the Messiah could Jesus have styled himself the "Son of Man." To those who were charging him in their hearts with a criminal arrogance, he sought to show plainly — and for this reason we must suppose that he took this title — how far he was from any undue self-exaltation. He doubtless meant by this designation to intimate his freedom from pretension, from pride, his goodwill to help his fellow-men, his renunciation of all that is deemed desirable, — rank, power, honor. And there were not wanting precedents in the Old Testament; as, for example, the expression "daughters of men," used in

[1] See App., Ill. 10, p. 126. [2] Ezek. ii. 1, and often afterwards.

opposition to "sons of God," designates those who were born of earth;[1] and the expression "sons of men" denotes persons of a humble rank.[2] Jesus had thus far been laboring not as a king clothed with power and majesty but as a representative and deliverer of the poor oppressed people; and as such, having a charge from God who alone can forgive sins, he forgave a suffering penitent the sins that weighed upon his soul.

It is certainly a matter of surprise that, to prove his authority to forgive sins, Jesus appeals to his power of healing,[3] for only by restoring the paralytic did he crush the cavils of the Scribes. His power of healing was surely in itself no proof of his authority to forgive sin.(*b*) Moses and the prophets had wrought much more wonderful miracles without claiming power to forgive sins. The mode of proving his authority, therefore, employed by Jesus might well have seemed defective. The connection between the preliminary moral influence exercised upon the mind of the paralytic and his cure can be understood only through a just appreciation of the characteristic work of Jesus. As he attached but little importance, as we have shown, to his power of healing, as he was grieved to perceive that it was mainly by the physical relief which he brought them that the people were drawn to him, as he had several times fled from the dangerous temptation of applauding crowds, it is impossible that he should have derived his authority to forgive sins from the bodily cure of the paralytic. The connection between the forgiveness of the sins of this man and his cure must be found elsewhere. The understood opinion of

[1] Gen. vi. 2. [2] Ps. xlix. 3. — (? Trans.)
[3] Mark ii. 10; Matt. ix. 6; Luke v. 24.

the Scribes was that he uttered vain words, lightly assuming to be the vicegerent of God. His own conviction was that he was fully empowered to remit the sins of the paralytic. This he had to maintain against his opposers. Let it be borne in mind that the point of the narration is the forgiveness of sins, and that what happened subsequently was caused by the doubt raised of his authority to forgive. The words, "Thy sins are forgiven thee," were no barren words. They had sent a quickening influence into the inmost being of the paralytic. If his disease, as we may well suppose, were the consequence of some sinful excess and had laid a heavy burden on his soul, no greater service could be done him than the assurance from the lips of one on whom he relied that his sins were forgiven. It was this assurance that wrought powerfully on the man, penetrating his diseased nervous system as with an electric stream, and restoring to him the use of his limbs. To utter the words, "forgiveness of sins," — thought Jesus in reference to the cavilling Scribes, — was easy enough. Levity might repeat them at any moment. But to speak them with such effect upon a disordered organism as to stimulate it to new elasticity and fresh strength, is possible only to one clothed with divine power. Whoever could thus speak the word with effect proved his authority to speak it. Tradition, with a view to magnifying the miracle, has separated here what properly belongs together.

5. Hence it is evident how little Jesus thought by assuring the sufferer of forgiveness to claim for himself an authority which, from the nature of the case, belonged to God alone. Even according to the fourth Gospel, which derives from a later tradition an incident somewhat similar,[1] Jesus guards himself against

[1] John v. 5.

the charge of seeking to make himself equal with God. He represents himself only as the commissioned and sent of God, doing as God commanded, and in all things taking the Father for his example.[1] Hence he assured the paralytic that his sins were forgiven, only because he was convinced that the man was worthy of Divine compassion. He only declared with solemnity what was already fulfilled in the Divine will, but what the sufferer, in his great weakness, physical and spiritual, was unable to assure himself of. He made that declaration in the consciousness of being empowered and sent by God to minister to the poor, suffering, sin-burthened people, longing for life and healing. With this consciousness began a new development of his public life. He had now proclaimed himself explicitly as a direct messenger of God to his countrymen. Firmly and fearlessly he took this position before the established teachers of his time. But the more clearly he felt such to be his office, the less could he esteem the cure of bodily diseases his chief work, and the more did it appear to him to be his true mission to awaken everywhere the desire for new moral and religious life, and to gather around him earnest-minded persons for the great work.

NOTES.

[*a.* p. 122. In order to justify his conjecture that the leper was substantially cured when he applied to Jesus, Dr. Schenkel states that the man came into the house where Jesus was, which he would not have dared to do had the disease been in its worst stage; and Mark i. 40 is referred to, but the reference does not warrant the statement. There is no need of the

[1] John v. 19.

supposition that the leper was half healed when he came to Jesus. The fact to be considered, which our author overlooks, is the extraordinary state of the leper's mind, the wonderful *faith* which he had in Jesus. Somehow or other, he had formed a great idea of the great sanctity and power of the singular man whose name was upon all lips. His suffering condition had rendered him receptive of such an idea to a degree of which those who were in perfect health could have little or no conception. Let the reader imagine, if he can, what must have been the state of that wretched creature's mind, suffering as he was under a loathsome disease and cut off from human fellowship, who could say with perfect faith to another, to all appearances a fellow-man, "If you will, I shall be instantly well!" Who shall set any limit to the effect which the person, thus conceived of and thus addressed, must have upon one who had such extraordinary confidence in him? Did not the eye, the voice of Jesus, and above all the touch of his hand penetrate with electric rapidity and power to the inmost centre of the sufferer's life and set in motion all the mysterious forces of his vitality? A spiritual philosophy can find no difficulty in the cures of leprosy and blindness and other forms of disease related in the history, when due consideration is given to the extraordinary moral and spiritual influence which Jesus had upon all men's minds, and especially upon those whose suffering condition made them singularly susceptible of his influence.

In the direction which Jesus gave to the leper to go and show himself to the priest, Dr. Schenkel sees a deference to the Mosaic Law which he considers Jesus as outgrowing at a subsequent period. But was it not necessary, if the man were to have the benefit of his cure, that it should be legally certified? And if so, it was but the dictate of humanity to direct him to comply with the requirements of the law.

b. 127. I cannot help thinking that Professor Schenkel finds a great deal of unnecessary difficulty in the case of the paralytic to which so large a portion of the foregoing chapter is devoted. Let it be considered. After an absence of some time, Jesus returned to Capernaum. As soon as it got abroad that he was there, the people flocked to the house where he was in such numbers that soon it was impossible to gain entrance to it, so dense was the crowd. While he was sitting in the house talking

to the people, there was laid before him a man suffering from paralysis, stretched upon a litter. As it had proved impossible to bring the paralytic in by the usual way, the persons who brought him had carried him up to the roof from an adjoining house, which was readily done, as the roofs of the houses were flat and the communication from one roof to another was very easy. In order to let the litter down into the room where Jesus was, some portion of the roof had to be removed. How touching is the perfect confidence which was thus manifested by this suffering man and his friends in Jesus! They evidently had not the slightest doubt that the man would be cured if he could only gain access to Jesus. They had entire faith in Jesus, in his power, in his goodwill. And remember there was, as I have already remarked, a moral element, which Professor Schenkel overlooks, in this faith. The people believed that Jesus was endowed with such wonderful power because he was a prophet, a holy man, and the grace of God was with him. There was in fine in this faith a virtual unconscious recognition of Jesus in the character in which he wished to be recognized. It could not be but that he should be moved by the simple, childlike confidence that was thus strikingly manifested in him. He shows his emotion in the tender manner in which he addresses the poor paralytic trembling with awe and faith and hope. "My son, thy sins are forgiven thee!" It may be that the suffering condition of the man had been caused by some sinful excess. Whether such were the case or not, he no doubt felt that his affliction had come upon him because of his sins. The Jews believed that it was on account of sin committed that disease and suffering befell men. Jesus read in the man's whole appearance and in all the circumstances of the case the state of the man's mind. He saw his faith, his self-abasement, his penitence; and in the eye of Jesus repentance was forgiveness. Is not this the very idea of Jesus? See Luke vii. 47. So that when he declared the man's sins forgiven, he assumed no undue authority; he simply stated what he saw, a fact. To certain scribes sitting there, whose frowning looks betrayed their feelings and showed how horror-stricken they were at his language, which sounded to them like blasphemous arrogance, Jesus turned and said in effect, "Why do you have such thoughts? Which is easier, to tell this man that his sins are forgiven, or to bid him rise and take up his bed and go? That you may know that I, man though I be, am

authorized to declare the forgiveness of sins," here he turned to the paralytic and in commanding tone exclaimed, "Rise up! and take your bed and go home!" Whereupon the man instantly rose, and taking up his bed went out before them all. Thus the proof that Jesus had spoken only what was true when he told the man his sins were forgiven was decisive. The removal of the suffering, which was held to be the sign and punishment of the man's sins, attested that his sins were forgiven. In order to see how naturally he rose up and obeyed the command of Jesus, we must appreciate fully the man's peculiar and extraordinary state of mind. In his eyes, made sharp by his sufferings, to his heart throbbing with awe and veneration and faith, Jesus must have seemed something more than human, and that commanding voice searched and inspired his vital energies with an unprecedented power, creating in him the new and irresistible consciousness of strength in which he rose up and seized his bed and went forth through all the awestruck crowd, who gave way before him with exclamations of wonder, acknowledging the power of God and saying one to another, We never saw anything like this! By such incidents as this, a popular feeling was excited which was magnetic in its influence upon individuals, especially upon such persons as were predisposed to be thus affected by previous suffering. We can only faintly conceive of the wonder and awe and faith that were thus created.

Since Jesus by his mere word produced such striking effects, even his common utterances, the mere sound of that voice which evil spirits obeyed and at which diseases vanished, must have thrilled the hearer with no ordinary emotion. Who can wonder that so many of his sayings were remembered and recorded? — Trans.]

CHAPTER VII.

THE OPEN CONFLICT.

1. The more clearly Jesus became conscious of his high mission for the healing of the hurt of Israel and for the establishment of a communion of individuals morally renewed and full of faith, so much the more must he have felt the need of enlarging his sphere. The small circle of the four, with which he began, was soon found insufficient; and it is significant that the fifth whom he chose was, not a fisherman but an officer of the customs, of a somewhat higher social grade, although odious in the eyes of the Jews generally.[1] When Jesus turned from the honest fishermen of the Lake of Gennesaret to the ill-reputed "publicans," he must have had some reasons that determined him. Such a choice must, doubtless, have seemed to most a great mistake. To select his nearest friends, the instruments of his work, from a class so much despised! And to this singular choice he added a still more singular mode of consecration. Having summoned this Levi (or, as he is elsewhere called, Matthew) to join the circle of his immediate disciples, Jesus invites him to an entertainment where it was no very select company that he was to meet. "Publicans and sinners," that is, guests of no good repute, were collected in the "house" of Jesus. No solemn religious rite, but a cheerful social occasion brought them around his person. Here are no needy sufferers seeking relief; but men from the middle and lower

[1] Mark ii. 14; Matt. ix. 9; Luke v. 27.

classes, to whom many evil reports attach, are invited by Jesus to a supper. He welcomes them and sits among them a kind and sympathizing host. We cannot wonder that his keeping company with such people gave occasion to remark. Would it not at the present day offend our notions of what is proper and fitting? He had already, from the very first, excited the indignation of the theologues. Those punctilious men of the letter had been outraged at his daring to take away, all at once, a heavy weight of guilt from an oppressed heart. This sinners' feast in his house gave them a much more plausible occasion for their excitement against him. They did not yet dare to wreak their spite directly on the master himself. They turned to the disciples, venting their malignity in sneers: "This, then, is your founder of a new and holy association, sitting and eating with publicans and sinners!" How must this remark have cut the embarrassed disciples to the heart! They were themselves surprised at the conduct of Jesus, and were at a loss for a reply. They went and confessed their embarrassment to him, and he, in ever-growing clearness, conscious of his true work, styles himself the "physician" called to the sick.[1]

When Jesus thus designated himself, it was not the physically diseased whom he had in view. He thought of those among the people who were suffering under deep-seated moral diseases, greed, sensuality, indifference to religious truth and duty, contempt of the Divine law, hate and bitter enmity to human laws, often, it is true, arbitrary and unjust, — these were the sins to which many of those gathered round his table must plead guilty. How different his treatment of this class

[1] Mark ii. 17; Matt. ix. 12; Luke v. 31.

from that of the Baptist! The latter had withdrawn himself from human companionship. The restless din of daily life was offensive to him. Even innocent enjoyments he had denied himself. He would fain have reared the kingdom of heaven in the desert of the Jordan and in a solitude of men. With the hammer of penance he crushed still more the bruised hearts that sought comfort and peace from him. Jesus also called sinners to repentance, but he did not lead them sadly and despairingly away from the world, but rather went himself into their world with messages of cheering and hope, carrying into it a heart full of good-will and pitying gentleness. He treated them as on an equal footing, going among them as a friend among friends. Of course he regarded them all as "sick." In relation to them he was conscious of being whole, able to heal, a physician. But as a kind and faithful physician, he sympathized tenderly in their condition, their temporal circumstances, their wants, cares and pains; and his commiserating love it was, which was the wonder-working power that went forth from him. How indispensable to the understanding of his character is the fact that he rested the future of his kingdom upon "Publicans and Sinners," on the very class of the population upon whom the priests and theologues, the higher ranks in general, looked down with scorn! Had he not attributed to this despised portion of the people greater sensibility to the truth, a more eager longing for the ideas which were his life, a more earnest desire for peace of mind and union with God, he certainly would not have turned to them in so pointed a manner. These things being considered, we see why it was that Jesus chose his disciples from among the people. In the poor and lowly of the land,

a fulness of moral and religious power, as yet unused, lay slumbering. The higher classes had outlived themselves. Men of the people were the men of the Christian future.

The answer that Jesus gave to his embarrassed disciples refers in its second clause to the Jewish theologues. "I am not come to call the righteous, but sinners." No reason appears for understanding these words as expressing contempt. The Scribes and their associates were comparatively "more righteous" than those whom Jesus had assembled at his table. They were most zealous adherents of the laws of the fathers. They obeyed the theocratic requirements with a punctiliousness, from their point of view, worthy of all praise; they loved their fatherland too in their way; they were the national party, hating the Romans, heartily abhorring every thing foreign and heathen, and relying implicitly upon the Old Testament promise of a Messiah, who was, after the model of David, to establish a Jewish empire among the Gentiles. The men, on the other hand, with whom Jesus usually associated, cared little for the traditions of the theocracy. The "publicans," as public officials, were not ill-disposed to the Romans, and, on this account, were more prepared to accept the spiritual idea of the Messiah, and transfer the kingdom of God to the inner world of the conscience and of faith.

It is at this point of time in the career of Jesus, when the people's faith in him had begun to strike its roots deeply and he had opened his heart to those especially whom the leaders of the theocratic party branded as "unbelieving" and "immoral," that the fourth Gospel introduces its story of the part taken by Jesus in a marriage feast at Cana. In its essential

features the incident is certainly not an invention. Probably witnessed by John, but distorted by fable, it was received into the Ephesian group of traditions. The wrong time[1] to which it is referred plainly reveals the presence of fable. The invitation to the feast given to Jesus and his disciples manifestly presupposes a considerable length of time previously spent by them in Galilee.[2] That Jesus did not decline to appear at joyous social parties had already become known. As in the first three Gospels, so here likewise Jesus appears with his disciples, in a gay social assemblage. Not only does he partake of the exhilarating wine with the light-hearted guests, differing thus from John and his disciples, the Nazarites and ascetics, whose particular aim it was to show their piety by abstinence from spirituous drinks, but, when the wine begins to fail and his mother with all a woman's solicitude for the honor of the host reminds him of it, he even turns water into wine, in order that this luxury may not be deficient on so joyous an occasion. From the point of view of later times Jesus seems here to have wrought a miracle which cannot be shown to have any moral and religious aim. But a miracle of this sort lies not within the limits of human power. God only, in his omnipotence, could work such a wonder. Granting the possibility of such an effect wrought by Almighty power through Jesus, the greatness of the act is out of all proportion to the insignificance of the purpose. According to the fourth Gospel, it was through this miracle that the "glory of Jesus" was first manifested.[3] But at the time at which the fourth Gospel places this miracle his glory had not yet been manifested to the disciples, to whom it was not revealed until a later

[1] John ii. 1. [2] John ii. 2. [3] John ii. 11.

period, and then confidentially,[1] to say nothing of the improbability of his choosing a wedding company for the occasion of the disclosure. And then again, did not the glory of Jesus manifest itself gradually indeed but more fittingly in changing sinful human hearts than in transforming unorganized matter? Nevertheless, the genuinely historical features of the story, colored though it is by fable, throw a significant light upon the portraiture of Jesus: his kindly desire that the enjoyment of the occasion should suffer no interruption, his wish that the wine should not fail, and the provision made, doubtless through Jesus, to supply the deficiency. Further than this we find nothing in the story that we can regard as historical; least of all can we favor such suppositions as that Jesus magnetized the water, which in consequence tasted like wine, or that the guests, in their enthusiastic admiration of his eloquence, mistook water for wine.[2]

2. In connecting himself with the middle and lower orders of the people, and by his intercourse, free from all asceticism, with those who were looked upon as lost to all sense of character, Jesus incurred odium among the disciples of John especially, who, to gain authority and give effect to their attack upon him, made common cause with the Pharisees, the national and scholastic party, from whom, however, in many respects they differed materially. Was entrance into the kingdom of God to be made thus convenient and easy? Without fasts, without stated prayers, without self-mortification, without renouncing the world, without poverty voluntarily chosen? The supper made for

[1] Mark ix. 2; Matt. xvii. 1; Luke ix. 28.

[2] See Appendix, Ill. 11, p. 138.

Matthew in the dwelling of Jesus, and his participation in the marriage-feast at Cana, especially shocked the disciples of John. They sent a deputation to Jesus, in which the Pharisees eagerly joined, and, with mingled wonder and reproof, put to him the question[1]: "Why do we (the disciples of John and the Pharisees) fast and thy disciples not?" The point of the question was no other than this: Why are your disciples wanting in all the signs of true religion?

Thus the moment had come when Jesus was bound to define more publicly and explicitly than he had yet done his relation to the Baptist and to the theocracy. He did not postpone the duty. As if the glad sounds of the marriage festival were still ringing in his ears, he likens himself to the bridegroom in the midst of his companions, the bridal guests, and by this comparison he intimates unmistakably that the character of his teaching and of his aims is exhilarating, joyous, that the ground tone of his whole being and working is reconciliation and peace. We may well imagine how there rose before his mind the future, when the sounds of joy and the voices of peace would die away, and trouble and sorrow gather round his followers. As he marked the hostile attitude of the disciples of John, uniting thus with his more dangerous and determined opponents, the Pharisees, there awoke in his breast a presentiment of persecutions to befall him and his followers. Then would come a time of fasting and mourning for his disciples, but it would be no formal fasting, voluntarily observed, but it would fulfil its work, as a purifying fire sent from God, in which Jesus and his friends must be tried.[2]

[1] Mark ii. 18; Matt. ix. 14; Luke v. 33.

[2] For a more simple and natural explanation of this passage, see Note *a* to Chap. III. p. 73. (TRANS.)

3. Up to this hour Jesus had avoided all public collision with the theocratic party. Previously by the injunction laid upon the leper to observe the Levitical law, he had even shown a disposition to respect the Mosaic and even the theocratic requirements. The hostile attitude of the disciples of John and the Pharisees showed clearly how little the maintenance of a lasting peace with the theocrats was to be thought of. The rupture was unavoidable. And with good reason the first three Gospels have preserved for us the words of Jesus, by which it was rendered complete. The saying of Jesus already referred to,[1] concerning the new piece on an old garment, and new wine in old skins, pronounces in a manner the most emphatic against every attempt to renew the Old Covenant and the theocracy founded thereon, by mere external reforms. In the eyes of Jesus, the Old Covenant has had its day, a new era in the order of the world has dawned; a decisive turning point in the moral and religious life of men is reached, a radical renovation of all things from within outwardly has become a necessity. This was the meaning of what Jesus said to the deputation.[2] One may imagine its effect upon his questioners. But the relation of Jesus also to the theocratic system had to be changed.

Henceforth he drops all the consideration which he had previously shown for the ceremonial law. It may seem remarkable that he never declared himself against circumcision. But at the same time he said nothing in favor of it, never recommended it to his disciples, never required it of believing Gentiles. He treated it as a matter of entire indifference.

Quite otherwise was it with the observance of the

[1] Page 53. [2] Mark ii. 21; Matt. ix. 16; Luke v. 36.

Sabbath, which no Jew could neglect without great offence. He did not indeed undertake long journeyings on Sabbath-days without a special purpose. Upon his authority his disciples made a path for themselves on a Sabbath through a cornfield by pulling up the ears of corn. They thus directly transgressed the Mosaic law, which forbade every kind of work on the Sabbath,[1] according to a later interpretation upon the penalty of death.[2] The second Gospel has preserved for us the original report on this point. While the first and third Evangelists represent the incident as if it were by eating the ears of corn that the disciples violated the Sabbath,[3] according to the second Gospel the disciples broke the law by making a road through a field, and while it was doubtful whether eating the corn to allay hunger could be regarded by the law as an offence,[4] the labor required to make a way through a field was unquestionably a serious violation of the Sabbath. The scribes, therefore, availed themselves of the offence thus given to create fresh embarrassments for Jesus. Reproach was now heaped upon reproach, accusation pressed upon accusation. First came the unlawful assumption of authority to forgive sins, then associating and eating and drinking with publicans and sinners, and in his own house; added to these things, the want of all legal strictness, all ascetic earnestness, and all appearance of piety, — and now also the open violation of the holy Sabbath, — what a heavy chain of grave charges was forged from these numerous particulars for the man of the "new teaching!"

And how was Jesus to defend himself against these accusations? The last, namely, that he allowed his dis-

[1] Levit. xxiii. 3.
[2] Numb. xv. 32.
[3] Matt. xii. 1; Luke vi. 1.
[4] Exod. xvi. 25.

ciples to break the Sabbath, was the most serious. He could not deny that they had done so. On the contrary, he justified them by the example of David.[1] Fleeing from Saul, tormented by hunger, David with his attendants ate of the sacred bread that the priests alone were allowed to eat.[2] The two cases have it must be confessed only the slightest resemblance to one another. There is, however, a point of resemblance. The idea of Jesus is that the order of nature is of more worth in the eye of God than the theocratic statute. The necessities of David and his attendants decided against the established prohibition. The law of nature is from God, the theocratic law from men.

By this declaration Jesus most certainly took a position in relation to the Mosaic law irreconcilable with its supreme obligation upon the conscience. Its authority was thus made dependent on circumstances. It was not unquestionably divine. God had made a higher law in the breast of man. Consequently the Mosaic Law had no claim to perpetuity and universal recognition. It is even intimated likewise by Jesus, that the time had then arrived when Israel was to be delivered from the yoke of traditional statutes and established with its tribes upon the eternal basis of the Divine Law. The addition of the first Gospel,[3] in which Jesus is reported as referring to the Sabbath labors of the priests with the remark, that in him was a "greater" than the priests, can hardly be authentic. It has the effect to blunt the point of what Jesus had said. It was not upon the idea that there was in him personally a higher power than that of the priests, that he sought to justify his disciples in doing what he had authorized. In the words preserved in the second

[1] 1 Samuel xxi. 1. [2] Levit. xxiv. 9. [3] Matt. xii. 5.

Gospel: "The Sabbath was made for man, and not man for the Sabbath,"[1] the argument of Jesus is presented in its true light. According to the Mosaic law, man was subject to the Sabbath, not the Sabbath to man. According to the Mosaic tradition, a human life had been ruthlessly sacrificed to the Sabbatical law at the command of the lawgiver.[2] This severity lay not in God's will and design. The Sabbath was to serve for the rest and refreshment of man. It was to be a day of relaxation, of peace, of joy, not a day of pain and sadness and terror. Jesus, therefore, declared explicitly that man is greater than the Sabbath, while by the Mosaic Law the Sabbath had an infinitely higher worth than man. Man, therefore, and Jesus especially as the ideal of the true dignity of man and of man's eternal prerogatives, is made lord of the Sabbath. Jesus thus proclaims freedom of worship.[3]

It is an erroneous supposition that Jesus thus and then proclaimed himself the Messiah. It is founded on the idea that he designated the "Messiah" as the Lord of the Sabbath. This supposition is wholly irreconcilable with the representation of the second Gospel. For how can it be inferred from the fact that the Sabbath is to serve man, that the "Messiah" is lord of the Sabbath? On the contrary the word of Jesus, according to its original sense, shows that in the first period of his career he designated himself, independently of the Messianic expectations, as the "Son of Man." It is to be carefully considered that he never aimed to be the Messiah in the Jewish sense, and therefore that he did not accept this title until he had given to the Messianic representations of the Old Tes-

[1] Mark ii. 27.
[2] Numb. xv. 32.
[3] Mark ii. 28; Matt. xii. 8; Luke vi. 5.

tament and of his contemporaries a new, thoroughly human significance. But he had recognized it with ever-increasing clearness as the aim of his life, to break down the theocratic forms of Judaism, to lift off the dead weight of the letter from the oppressed people, to set a bound to empty scholasticism and arrogant priestcraft, to raise the forgotten and neglected laity to moral and religious freedom, to give to those who were athirst the water of eternal life from the primal fountain of truth, to render possible to the outcast a life worthy of humanity and therefore pleasing to God, to elevate men to the higher world of the spirit which is in God, imperishable. As the Restorer of the original nobility and indefeasible dignity of human nature, he called himself the "Son of man"; he was the loftiest representative of all human goodness, beauty and holiness that has ever appeared on earth.

The party of the high Jewish Church and of the orthodox theology saw themselves threatened by Jesus in their dearest hopes and interests. Since he had uttered the condemnatory word upon the old garment and the old skins, the actual rupture with them was complete. Thenceforth he was regarded as the determined opponent of the laws received from the fathers, as an agitator dangerous to all religion, an enemy of all time-honored "barriers and restrictions." The hierarchs would gladly have proceeded against him by process of law. But his extensive connections with the people, the devotion to his person of all those whom he had cured and comforted, the unimpeachable purity of his motives and efforts, the elevation and gentleness of his character, his simple and unassuming demeanor, rendered it unadvisable to undertake a criminal prosecution against him at once. To detect

some exposed point in him was the object to which his opposers directed all their cunning, stimulated as it could only be by the fierce hatred and fanaticism of those hierarchical possessors of power. From this time he finds himself surrounded by spies, — every step dogged, every motion, as far as possible, brought under suspicion. It is sworn in secret that he must be put to death. His violation of the law, repeated in the healing of a sick man on the Sabbath, offered the next opportunity to prepare to deal him a heavy blow. The opposing forces on both sides had reached their acme.

4. It had come to this; it lay in the nature of the case. The hierarchical high Church party looked for the salvation of Israel to come through the absolute sway of the hierarchy and the strictest observance of the ceremonial law. While they fanned the hostility of Judaism to the Gentile world into the fiercest flame, they hoped to subjugate the Gentiles or to perish. And they were ready to hail as the deliverer of the nation, as the true descendant of the heroic line of David, as the Saviour and Messiah, him who should be able to convert the theocratic law into a rod of iron for mankind. But in Jesus there had appeared one who by his personal moral force and spiritual greatness compelled their admiration indeed, but who, at the same time, forced them to see that he stood in the sharpest contrast to all their hopes and efforts. Looking at him from the point of view from which the Jewish hierarchs and theologues regarded him, it is evident to us that with their Messianic expectations they could not recognize him as the Messiah, and we can hardly blame them for not doing so. Up to this time Jesus had made no claim to the dignity of the

Messiah. On the contrary, he had taken a position much higher than that assigned to the Messiah by the Old Testament prophets. He had become conscious and he had declared that he was the initiator of a holier and more spiritual communion with God than that instituted by Moses and the prophets. In taking his new position towards his contemporaries, he had placed God himself and the relations of the conscience to God, and especially the Holy Scriptures, in a new light. The theology of the Jewish schools, which assumed as its exclusive privilege the interpretation of the Scriptures, lost, through Jesus, its special right of interpretation. It was even seen to stand in the way of all attempts to penetrate into the depths of the divine nature, to central truth. With its dead phraseology it had corrupted the Scriptures at the core, quenched their spirit, and extinguished their light. The priesthood had come to stand as a wall of partition between God and Israel, it had driven the people away from the heart of God. The sacrifices were mere external forms. The Temple, notwithstanding all the pomp with which the love of art and pretended piety of Herod the Great had decorated it, was a symbol of exclusiveness, of intolerance, of national hatred. The higher hierarchy was a barrier against every reform, against every breath of fresh religious thought, against every effort to reanimate the decaying condition of things from the original springs of moral and religious life.

Upon Jesus there had dawned the conviction that the eternal Truth, which is from our Father in heaven and which is the central life of things, had embodied itself anew in him directly and originally, whilst all the learning of the schools and all priestly mediation

and ceremonial observances were but as a gold-fringed covering, hiding from sight all that is imperishable in the divine, all that is real in humanity. He had taught men and healed them, he had proclaimed the kingdom of the spirit, he had gone about doing good, condemning the evil, encouraging the poor, raising the lowly from the dust, comforting those who mourned, and gathering the pious together in the power of his Father from above. Ignorant obedience or willing love in the domain of religion and morality, — this was now the question. Was the pure truth of the spirit to be diffused abroad, or were false human traditions to be still more firmly established? Were the souls of men to be rescued, or ruined? Not the "Messiah" did he call himself, but emphatically Deliverer, Saviour, and doer of good.[1] "Which is lawful on the Sabbath, to do good or to do evil, to save life or to kill?" In this office of Saviour and Redeemer, he felt himself a match for all the cunning and violence, which with ever growing determination were taking arms against him. By his query whether it were not permitted to do good on the Sabbath, his accusers were struck dumb. A holy wrath flashes from his eyes, a deep sadness fills his soul. He knows now that there is nothing to be done for the hierarchical party in Israel, — that it is incorrigible. And thenceforth this party shows its obduracy in act. The second Gospel tells us that the Pharisees now joined the Herodians against Jesus, that is, the national party entered into a league with the foreign (Roman) party of Herod Antipas.[2] This conspiracy of the Pharisees and Herodians was far more dangerous than the merely tempora-

[1] Mark iii. 4; Luke vi. 9.
[2] Mark iii. 1; Matt. xi. 11; Luke vi. 9.

ry alliance of the Pharisees and the disciples of John. Religious fanaticism was now leagued with the dread of political disorder. The aversion to moral and religious reform was so strong in the leaders of both parties that the difference between them, otherwise so significant, disappeared for the time before the common danger. The governing class in Israel had now only one interest, to render harmless as soon as possible this "misleader of the people," Jesus of Nazareth.

NOTE.

[The idea of Jesus would be much more vividly depicted to the imagination, much more distinctly defined, had our author noted more minutely the incidents which illustrate it. But in the foregoing chapter he uses the particulars of the history only as they serve the views which he takes of the position in which Jesus stood to the theocracy and its supporters. Thus, in the answer given by Jesus to the question why he did not require his disciples to fast, Dr. Schenkel finds an allusion to the worn-out formalities of the Jewish law in the "old garment" and "old wine-skins" of which Jesus makes mention. But where is the necessity of supposing that Jesus meant anything more by that homely reference than to set in a striking light the absurdity of disregarding the fitness of things and of putting such incongruities together as fasting and his joyous and excited disciples? (See note *a* to ch. iii. p. 75.) So again the use made in the text (p. 147) of the question put by Jesus to the Pharisees upon the occasion of the healing of the man with a withered hand, leads us to suspect that that incident is but imperfectly apprehended by our author. Indeed one cannot avoid the impression that Professor Schenkel is under some embarrassment in regard to those passages of the history which involve what is popularly termed the miraculous. He accepts them only at a distance, and is shy of approaching them too nearly. And yet, I apprehend, he would have found his reward, had he taken the pains to examine them more closely. Consider, for example, the case of

the man with a withered hand. But first observe how at the very commencement of his public life Jesus at every step gave greater and still greater offence, and with what memorable sayings he met every charge.

First it was objected to him what bad company he kept; to which his unanswerable reply was: "The well need not a physician, but only the sick. I did not come to give an invitation to righteous men, but to sinners." (Norton's trans.) Then the charge was that he did not impose upon those that gathered round him and who passed for his disciples, the religious observances, the fasts, that all pious Jews kept. And here too one finds in the striking answer that he gave to this charge, the reason why it has stamped itself into the memory of mankind. "His disciples," he said, "were then as joyous and exhilarated as so many wedding guests around a bridegroom, and to require them in such a humor to fast would be as incongruous as to put new cloth in an old garment or new wine into old wine-skins. But a time would come when the bridegroom would be taken from them, and then would be the time for fasting." Next we are told that it was objected to him not only that he enjoined no fasts, but that he countenanced his disciples in a positive violation of the established institutions of religion. Going through a field of grain on a Sabbath, they pulled up the grain, to make a path for themselves, — so Dr. Schenkel understands Mark's account, and we think justly, — thus working on the Sabbath and desecrating the day. So it was charged. In reply to this accusation, Jesus enunciated a truth which his own followers now, after nearly a score of centuries, have yet to learn: that the Sabbath is subordinate to man and not man to the Sabbath. The world has not yet caught the full tone of his simple and liberal thought. He is still in advance of mankind. We are familiar with these sayings of Jesus, but were we not, we should be penetrated to the inmost with their immortal wisdom, and far enough from doubting the reality of the occasions that called them forth.

But not only did he countenance his disciples in violating the Sabbath, he himself was continually doing things on that day which occasioned such an excitement that the formal religionists of the time were again shocked, — shocked at such a disturbance of the silence and decorum of that holy season. Thus we read (Mark iii. 1 – 6) that at an early period when he was again teaching in the synagogue on the Sabbath, there happened to be

present a man with a withered hand. What the precise nature of the infirmity was we are not informed. It was probably caused by nervous weakness. The attention of Jesus was called to the case. The Pharisees were on the watch to see whether he would cure this man that they might charge him with breaking the Sabbath. So bigoted were they in their narrow formalism that they never considered what a kindness it would be. It was enough that it would be a manifest departure from the sacred routine of the day. The music of humanity sounded sacrilegious in their ears when it broke in upon the consecrated monotony of their holy Sabbath. And now their bigotry was rendered still more ferocious by their fear and hatred of this new Teacher, whose increasing popularity threatened the spiritual ascendency, which was as dear to them as life. They longed to destroy him. They were thirsting for his blood. Jesus bade the man with the withered hand stand forth so that all might see and understand the case. The enemies of Jesus, probably some of those Pharisees from Jerusalem who were watching his course, were grouped by themselves, whispering together and furtively casting around their malignant glances. Jesus saw and understood them. And suddenly when the man had taken the position required and was standing there, trembling all over with nervous agitation under the eyes of the crowded assembly, Jesus turned to the little knot of Pharisees and asked: "Is it lawful to do good on the Sabbath-days or to do evil? to save life or to kill?" Is not the dagger-like point of the question apparent? Was it not a terrible home-thrust? He was intending to do good, to relieve a disabled fellow-man, — they were harboring murderous thoughts. They would fain destroy Jesus. "Which of us," he virtually asks, "is breaking the Sabbath, you or I?" Obdurate as they were, they could not but feel the keenness of this query. It pierced even their consciences, indurated as they were by spiritual pride and the selfish lust of power. They had not a word to mutter. They held their peace. He paused after putting the question, blasting them with a look of mingled sorrow and indignation, and then turning directly to the man who was standing there all in a tremor of undefined expectation, not knowing what would be done next, commanded him to stretch out his hand! Instantly, as one may readily conceive, as if affected by an electric force, out went the arm. Observe, Jesus applied no mysterious power to the enfeebled limb. He did not mutter over it any magical

formula. But, in the simplest form of speech, without any parade of power, he addressed the man, — spoke to *him*. The transcendent influence of the personal presence of Jesus, of his looks and tones, stirring the deepest sentiments of the man's nature, wonder, awe, veneration, stimulated into unwonted activity the consciousness of his own personal force. Subjected to so mighty an influence, he could not but obey. He could not have told you how he did it. But at that authoritative bidding, it flashed upon him at once like lightning, that he could extend his arm, and it was done.

In questioning the reality of this fact, we forget, if this story were a fiction, how impossible it would have been to represent Jesus as producing such an effect without marring the unity and personal elevation of his character. Were it a fiction it would belittle him. As it is, he stands before us on this occasion in the characteristic simplicity and unconscious greatness of his moral nature. — TRANS.]

THIRD SECTION.

THE FIRST INSTITUTION OF A NEW COMMUNION.

CHAPTER VIII.

THE DEDICATORY DISCOURSE.

1. The fierce life and death opposition which, after the lapse of a few months, the hierarchical party made to the teachings and labors of Jesus, had one advantage: it caused their relative positions to be speedily defined. In the first period of his public career Jesus had sought to avoid a rupture with the popular religion and its supporters. When he cured the leper he had guarded carefully against giving the priestly party any good ground for their opposition. But the logic of facts had led further than Jesus himself originally intended. Although he had not entitled himself the Messiah foretold by the prophets, yet, as a moral and religious reformer of Israel, as one who recognized the worth of human nature as no one before him had ever done, as the friend of the people, self-sacrificing and laborious, and especially as the friend of the suffering, he had come, particularly in those disturbed and ominous times, to be a person so distinguished above all others, that he was either to be advocated and adhered to with the whole soul, or to be avoided with horror.

Under these circumstances, the question whether

Jesus were not the promised Messiah in a higher sense of the title might well be agitated. The conflict with the hierarchical party had contributed greatly to extend his fame and enlarge the sphere of his activity. His name was sounded far beyond the borders of Galilee, although he had as yet made no approach to Jerusalem, the centre of the theocratic power. In his mode of proceeding he used great circumspection and prudence. In order to escape the jealous eyes and misrepresentations of his enraged enemies, he quitted the scene of his last collision with them, and betook himself, partly, we may suppose, for bodily refreshment after a time of so much excitement, to the Lake of Gennesaret. But he had no time for rest. The people flocked to him in greater numbers than ever. Not only from the neighboring cities of Syria, from Tyre and Sidon to the North, but also from Idumæa and Judea to the South, and even from Jerusalem itself, throngs came to him, for the most part, indeed, only from curiosity, or in search of physical relief.[1] Relief, however, appears to have been afforded by him only in cases of mental disease. Among the wonder-loving multitude, the belief had spread, that, in order to be cured, it was only necessary to touch his person,[2] a belief all the more groundless as Jesus had never wrought any cures except by moral means, by the power of the word and the spirit. (*a*) Strikingly enough, it was the mentally diseased who first entitled him "Son of God," (*b*) the Messiah in the sense of the ancient prophets; but he peremptorily disclaimed titles of this sort, not, as modern interpretation assumes, because he did not at that time wish his Messianic

[1] Mark iii. 7; Matt. xii. 16; Luke vi. 17.
[2] Mark iii. 11; Luke vi. 19.

dignity to be known,[1] but because he did not consider himself the Messiah of the Old Covenant.

2. He now took a step, essentially in advance, towards the formation of the new Israelitish Communion of God. At first only four disciples had attached themselves to his person and his cause, and these had been joined by a few others. He now chose the precise number of twelve, to be intimately associated with him as fellow-laborers in his great work. They were instructed to carry the tidings of the Kingdom of God from Galilee, the centre of his sphere of labor, throughout Judea, and to help the suffering according to their ability.[2] These twelve were for the most part men from the people, of simple manners, without culture. Only a few of them possessed decided qualities of character ranking them above the rest. These Jesus distinguished by surnames of honor: to Simon he gave the name of "Peter" (rock), and James and John he called "Boanerges" (sons of thunder). He was doubtless led to make this limited selection of twelve with direct reference to the twelve tribes of Israel. From the bosom of the masses, Israel was first of all to be morally and spiritually renewed. A new Israel was represented by this little company of disciples, an Israel of the future, in which no inequality of calling, no privilege of birth or rank, no external distinction, should determine official positions and personal dignity; in which no priests or theologians should speak for the laity; but it was precisely the humble and the despised who should be selected for the most important positions. Consequently the choice of twelve had a specially symbolical meaning. It was a declaration to

[1] Mark iii. 12; Matt. xii. 16.

[2] Mark iii. 14; Matt. x. 1; Luke vi. 13.

the Jewish people, intelligible to all, that the hierarchy and theocracy were tottering to their fall, and that a new divine society was coming into existence.

Thus viewed, it is evident why many of the Twelve attained to no historical importance: they were designed only for symbols. Several of them have had, however, a great historical destiny. The most considerable person among them was Peter, who, as his surname of "Rock" indicates, distinguished himself by a rare activity. That he was wanting in strength of character, his denial of Jesus and his duplicity at Antioch show.[1] He had fire and spirit, but little insight, and was very narrow-minded. The brothers, James and John, sons of Zebedee, appear to have been of an ardent and ambitious temperament; the former of them suffered martyrdom under Herod Agrippa (44 A.D.), the latter, softened and purified in the fires of trial, reached an advanced age at Ephesus, where he was Bishop of the Church. These three constituted the inner circle of the disciples of Jesus, to whom he turned without reserve in the darkest hours of his life.

Among the rest there is one, however, who has become most widely known through the crime of his mysterious treachery, — Judas of Kerioth.[2] If we adopt the common view of the person of Jesus, his choice of this disciple is not to be explained. Did Jesus take this man into the number of his friends, in order that he should be a traitor? The idea offends the moral sense. At the time Jesus formed the circle of the Twelve, he must have seen in Judas a man worthy of his confidence. It was only by degrees that there was developed in the Iscariot the germ of evil which might possibly have been destroyed by the force of truth and

[1] Gal. ii. 1.

[2] See Appendix, III. 12, p. 155.

love. Most of the men who followed Jesus as disciples had their weaknesses and defects. They did not belong to the "righteous," they were "sinners" coming from the middle and lower orders, among whom, fortunately, sin was not glossed over and polished, but appeared in its natural deformity. When Jesus drew them into his sphere, they were powerfully attracted by the spiritual greatness and moral nobility of his character, but they were not free from selfishness and ambition. They did not indeed at the first accept him as the Messiah, but they regarded him as a prophet of wonderful gifts, from whom for their devotion to his cause and his person they expected thanks and rewards. And at that time, when Jesus undertook to form the association of the Twelve, when he was teaching them to be his messengers to the people of Israel, when, although not declaring himself to be the Messiah, he was adopting measures which pointed to him as the spiritual head of a new Israel, — it might well be that hopes should begin to stir in those immediately around him, hopes that quickened into life the evil germ of ambition and self-gratification. How scarcely perceptible, how almost unconscious and dreamy, is the transition in human hearts from the straight path of truth and goodness into the devious ways of error and sin!

3. When Jesus gathered the Twelve around him, he felt bound, in opposition to the accusations and assaults that had been made upon him, to declare himself publicly and solemnly in relation to his mission. He considered such a declaration due to himself, to his adherents and friends, and especially to his cause. He made it, therefore, not in the form of a mere defence, designed to vindicate himself, but in the form of a dedica-

tion of the New Communion to their glorious destiny.[1] This dedicatory discourse was to give a clear and simple explanation of his whole position towards Judaism; it was to enable all to understand why especially he had entered into a contest with the traditional hierarchy and theology of his country, a contest constantly becoming more serious. This discourse was addressed, not indeed to the people, but to the Twelve, who were to publish more extensively the truths and principles set forth.

It is remarkable that the oldest record does not contain this important discourse. It appears to have fallen out of it;[2] for that it should have been intentionally omitted is not probable. In the first and third Gospels it appears in a shape enlarged and curtailed.[3] What Jesus originally said exists most accurately in the shorter form.

According to this report, his discourse was divided into four parts: 1. Four benedictions and four maledictions;[4] 2. An admonition to humanity and the love of one's enemies;[5] 3. A warning against spiritual and censorious judgments;[6] 4. An admonition to serve his cause, not merely in word, but in deed.[7] In the first Gospel the maledictions are wanting in the first section, while the benedictions are amplified. Then follows in the first Gospel[8] a description of the duty of the disciples, and of the relations of the Gospel to the Old Testament law, a description which does not belong in that connection, and is not in conformity to the

[1] See Appendix, Ill. 13, p. 157.
[2] Mark iii. 19, where the connection appears to be broken.
[3] Matt. v.–vii; Luke vi. 20, &c.
[4] Luke vi. 20–26.
[5] Luke vi. 27–36.
[6] Luke vi. 37–42.
[7] Luke vi. 43–49.
[8] Matt. v. 13, &c.

higher point of view which Jesus had then reached.[1] But the first Gospel joins Luke again in his second section, the injunction to the love of one's enemies. A further addition in the first Gospel is formed by the whole sixth chapter, containing the precepts concerning almsgiving, prayer, fasting, worldly goods and cares, — precepts uttered by Jesus in another connection. Only with the seventh chapter does the first Gospel connect itself again with the third section as it stands in Luke;[2] then follow several separate admonitions, some of which agree with Luke;[3] and the conclusion corresponds with the fourth section as Luke has it.[4]

Thus explained, the groundwork of the discourse of Jesus is complete in Luke, while the first Evangelist connects parts of other discourses with it, forming an artistic discourse with great breadth of view and variety of topics, a discourse such as we can hardly suppose Jesus to have pronounced on one particular occasion and for a special purpose.

4. In this discourse of dedication Jesus represented the disciples whom he had chosen, as the new Israel, the true God's Communion in the midst of a misguided theocratic nation, and himself as the founder, the head, the representative and protector thereof. But even on this occasion he did not declare himself the Messiah. Conscious though he was of fulfilling the Old Testament dispensation of salvation, he was equally conscious of his opposition to the Messianic idea; and to the office of the Messiah in the Old Testament sense of the word he neither would nor could make any claim. On the contrary, he sought now to portray to

[1] Matt. v. 13–18; Luke xvi. 17.
[2] Matt. vii. 1.
[3] Matt. vii. 16, &c.
[4] Matt. vii. 24–27.

his disciples the image of the true Israel, and the principal qualities of the true Israelite after God's own heart. By four marks was the true Israelite to be distinguished: poverty, want, sorrow, and shameful persecution for the Son of Man's sake. These marks, in the first Gospel, are described as "spiritual"; the original significance of the words of Jesus had ceased to correspond to the idea which tradition at a later period fashioned of his person. It seemed to him his first duty not to conceal from his disciples the deadly opposition which he had to encounter, as the founder of the new Communion of God, from the leaders and representatives of the Old Israel. But the period has not yet arrived which Jesus, in the beatitudes, brings before the eyes of his disciples. They still possess their houses, although they must by and by relinquish them for the Gospel's sake. They do not yet suffer want; they are not yet bowed down with sorrow, not yet reduced to the last extremity. But the loss of all earthly possessions, and even of the lawful enjoyments of life, awaits them in consequence of their connection with him. Jesus may not conceal from them their approaching lot. But so great and glorious was to be their reward in the heavenly kingdom for the faithful fulfilment of their high duty, that notwithstanding the sufferings that threatened them Jesus pronounced them blessed. In so doing, he expressed the thought which was the absolute law of his own life. To suffer for God's sake is in and of itself blessedness, the highest happiness. Such suffering, through its consequences and aims, becomes gain and honor.

He was fully aware that he thus put himself in decisive and radical opposition to the worldly ideas of the hierarchy. A life of undisturbed enjoyment,

lengthened to the utmost limit, worldly plenty, a prosperous career in all respects, brilliant, victorious over all enemies: — such was the reward which the believer in the Old Testament hoped for in return for his righteousness to the letter, shown in strict obedience to the theocratic precepts. It was precisely the opposite of all this that Jesus commended to his disciples as the happiness to be striven for in his kingdom. Everything was renounced by him which a Jew held dear, even those Messianic expectations in which Israel saw in prospect the complete gratification of his thirst for enjoyment, honor, revenge and power. Thus, if Jesus sought to act the part of the Messiah, he could do it only by fearlessly and decidedly opposing the promises and hopes of his countrymen in regard to the Messianic era.

In order to deepen the impression of this first declaration, and to render still more striking the difference between his view and the theocratic view of life and the world, he now pronounced a woe upon those whom the Old Testament lawgiver had pronounced blessed: the rich, who have their reward in earthly possessions; upon the full, who nevertheless are gnawed by hunger; the joyous, who yet have trouble; those whom men speak well of, but who hear only lies. Especially did he condemn emphatically the Old Testament doctrine of compensation, and that external formal piety inseparable from it; and in opposition thereto, he set up as the moral ideal of the Divine kingdom a new doctrine of compensation, placing the reward of virtue in virtue itself, and in the conscious possession of eternal life. Whosoever suffers for righteousness' sake tastes the blessedness, the bliss of heaven: this is the *first* watchword of the Communion founded by Jesus.

The Old Testament theocracy represented and treated as enemies all outside the Jewish nationality, and the Mosaic Law had commanded their extermination.[1] Israel alone was the chosen Son of God;[2] to him, upon his obedience to the Law, all the goods and blessings of earth were promised. Theocratic hope, therefore, knew no higher object and no aim more exalted than the dominion of Israel over the Gentile world; and a deep-rooted hatred of everything foreign was the special characteristic of the Pharisaic hierarchical party. The second section of the dedicatory discourse was directed against the exclusiveness and intolerance of the Jews, and their hatred of foreigners: this is the *second* watchword of the Divine kingdom established by Jesus. Blessing was to be returned for curses, intercession to take the place of imprecation.

The Old Testament Law had not only excluded Gentiles from salvation, but had made revenge for injuries suffered a sacred duty, enjoining retaliation.[3] "An eye for an eye, a tooth for a tooth" is its precept. Directly the opposite is enjoined by Jesus as the Lawgiver of the New Covenant, as the transfigured Moses of the new Israel. His disciples were not only to bear injuries patiently, but under all circumstances to treat others as they wished to be treated themselves. To love those who love us is the impulse of the mere natural man. The Old Testament Law, according to the idea of Jesus, rests entirely upon selfishness, the instinct of self-preservation never free from self-seeking. But in the new Israel egotism was to be overcome by the holy and hallowing power of love. Of this love there is only one measure, — the pitying, immeasurable love of God himself.

[1] Numb. xxxiii. 51. [2] Exod. iv. 22. [3] Levit. xxiv. 17.

No evil practice was more prevalent among the hierarchical theologues and their followers than that of judging consciences and sitting in condemnation upon others. This practice grew out of the assumption that their mode of religious thought, faith, and life was alone correct. From this belief came the bigotry which was one of the most offensive features of Judaism. "Judge not, condemn not," is therefore the command of Jesus to his disciples in the third section of his dedicatory discourse. To judge and condemn the religious views and convictions of others is the more to be reprobated as it blinds us to our own religious wants, and he who accustoms himself to judge others by his prejudices will never get rid of them. When a fanatic of this description assumes the office of a teacher, his pupils will become arrogant and intolerant, and must of course remain religiously ignorant. Intolerance and the habit of denunciation lead, moreover, inevitably to hypocrisy; the more the bigot is lacking in humility and self-distrust, the more he seeks to hide his sins and defects under the cloak of formal observances. Tenderness of judgment in all matters of conscience, tolerance of the religion of others, respect for one's neighbor in his most sacred convictions, — this is the *third* watchword of a disciple of Jesus in the Kingdom of God.

The leaders of the clerical party required as the indispensable conditions of true piety external conformity to the theocratic precepts, submission to the authority of tradition, and religious zeal. Piety and virtue were thus things to be acquired, not a free and living growth from within, from the personal life. "Out of the heart" says Jesus, therefore, to his disciples in the fourth section of his discourse, "come

good and evil"; they are emphatically man's own work, for which he is responsible. But how pitiable is it when empty words take the place of deeds, when babbled forms of verbal prayer and wearisome professions are substituted for a sincere God-devoted life. Thus it was with the clerical party. Their expectations of the Messiah, their schemes for the future were mere wild dreams, coming to no practical result, prompting to no joyful self-sacrifice, even for their religion; there was no love, no self-forgetting earnestness, no humility. Jesus had already perceived traces of this spirit among his followers. Many attached themselves to his person with apparent devotion, calling him Lord and Master, but there was no inward change, no outward withdrawal from their old manner of life. They had taken no firm stand upon the new ground. Jesus strikingly compared these persons to a man building his house upon the unstable quicksand. Words without intentions corresponding, promises without the power of performance, are houses without foundations. Unconditional, self-sacrificing devotion to the kingdom of God is the *fourth* watchword of a disciple of Jesus in this kingdom.

The new Israel, the Communion of true disciples, is described in this discourse of Jesus in brief and striking outlines. Its animadversions are at the same time directed against the religion of forms and traditions, against the selfish doctrine of rewards and punishments, the obdurate pride and hatred, the empty verbal piety, of the day. True piety has its reward in itself. It embraces all men with equal, sincere love. It is tolerant of the religious convictions of others, and preserves its modesty by a self-denying moral activity. It is not probable that this discourse to his

disciples contained anything more originally than what Luke has preserved from the oldest traditions. It was not yet time for Jesus to address his disciples as the salt of the earth, and the light of the world;[1] they had yet to stand the first test. The moment had not yet come when he would summon them to the decisive conflict with the false righteousness of "the Scribes and Pharisees";[2] the time for that lay still somewhat distant. Circumstances likewise did not yet render necessary particular instructions concerning almsgiving, prayer, fasting, and anxiety about temporal things.[3] These, and yet other precepts of less importance, genuine utterances of Jesus unquestionably, of which it is difficult to determine in what connection they originally stood, have been interwoven, not always with entire skill, into the great discourse by the author of the first Gospel.[4] With this initiatory discourse, however, an important step was taken by Jesus; he had now solemnly withdrawn himself from all living connection with the Jewish hierarchy and theology as well as with those who represented them. He no longer stood within the pale of the old Mosaic Covenant. He had announced himself the Framer of a new Covenant, the Founder of a new Israel.

NOTES.

[*a*. p. 153. Any one who examines carefully the one case of cure occasioned by touching the garments of Jesus, related with any minuteness, will be satisfied not only that the cure was real, but that it was effected by "moral means," as Jesus himself assured the woman cured when he told her that it was her *faith* that cured her. The people who expected to be healed, and

[1] Matt. v. 13.
[2] Matt. v. 20, &c.
[3] Matt. vi. 2, &c.
[4] Matt. vii. 6–15.

who were healed — some of them — by touching his clothes, were mistaken in imagining there was a medical virtue therein, but they were not mistaken in the faith which they had in Jesus himself, and which was the efficient cause of their cure.

b. Ibid. It is indeed remarkable, but it was very natural and easily to be explained, that the mentally diseased should be the first to address Jesus as the Messiah. The people at large were beginning to surmise that he was that exalted personage, but they were restrained from giving free utterance to the suspicion by considerations which were not likely to be regarded by the insane who spoke aloud what was beginning more or less vividly to arise in all men's minds. It is observable that the blind also applied Messianic titles to Jesus. Naturally enough the diseased and the blind considered the fact that he was able to relieve them as sufficient and decisive proof that he was the Messiah. — TRANS.]

CHAPTER IX.

THE KINGDOM OF GOD AND THE KINGDOM OF THE DEVIL.

1. It was probably upon his return from the solemn initiation of his disciples into their new mission, their Apostolic calling,[1] that certain Jewish elders came to him from a Roman captain, whose favorite slave was dangerously ill, with the request that he would heal the boy. The case was urgent, for upon approaching the dwelling of the Roman, Jesus received a second message from him,[2] begging him not to trouble himself to come to the sick youth; a word from Jesus would suffice for his cure. According to the third Evangelist, who has followed the original report, which as it appears has been lost in Mark,

[1] Luke vi. 13. [2] Luke vii. 2–10; Matt. viii. 5.

Jesus did not actually enter the Centurion's house; he only remarked that he had found no such strong faith in Israel; and the messengers, upon their return to the dwelling, found the boy relieved. Neither of the nature of the sickness (the statement of the first Gospel[1] that it was palsy appears to belong to the later tradition), nor of the mode of cure, have we any precise information. As Jesus seems not to have seen the sufferer, the restoration took place while Jesus was not present. It is therefore not improbable that the extraordinary mental excitement of the youth, together with his strong faith in the healing power of Jesus, was the chief cause of his cure. A circumstance of greater importance is, that now occurred the first meeting of Jesus with a Gentile. How significant this, in connection with his discourse to his disciples! He had just renounced all alliance with theocratic Judaism, and already a pious Gentile stretches out to him a help-seeking hand, which he does not repel because the Gentile has "faith."[2] Imperfect as this faith may be, there lies in it the germ of moral renovation, and it was the fruit of that humility which opens the heart to the light of truth.

2. Without further delay Jesus betook himself to his dwelling in Capernaum. The report of the consecration and commissioning of the Apostles, and of the healing of the Gentile slave, appears to have spread quickly through the town. Again the people flocked to the house where Jesus was, and in such numbers that neither he nor his disciples, notwithstanding their previous labors and fatigue, had time to take any food.[3] In the mean while a storm had been gathering against him in his own family. Even his

[1] Matt. viii. 6. [2] Luke vii. 9. [3] Mark iii. 20.

most violent opponents, the Jewish theologues and hierarchs, could not deny that there was an extraordinary power in him. As they could not bring themselves to recognize it as a divine power, it was in conformity with the spirit of the time to ascribe it to a cause the opposite of divine. As it appears, some Pharisees dwelling in Galilee had really made complaint of Jesus to the spiritual authorities at Jerusalem, and although no legal proceedings had been taken against him, yet the suspicion had gone pretty widely abroad that he was in league with the demon world, and did those extraordinary things by the help of Satan and his ministers. This charge, the offspring of the grossest blindness, was it is true a confession that he, the founder of a super-earthly kingdom, was a person of no ordinary power. But he had had to league himself with the powers of hell. The public was to be led to regard him with horror, as an ambassador and champion of the kingdom of the Devil, an enemy of God. A man who ruled the world of unclean spirits, and, in alliance with the devil, healed the sick, could be, not a benefactor, but only an enemy of Israel, and indeed of all mankind.[1] Although, from fear of the populace and from lack of proof, no one ventured to urge against Jesus the fatal accusation of being a "magician," an ally of the Devil, yet his kinsfolk might be rendered distrustful of him and made to believe the fable of his being in league with the Evil One, and so be used as the instruments of his destruction. They were led to believe[2] that in consequence of demoniacal possession he had been seized with madness, and that he had thus himself become a demoniac, and they allowed themselves to be persuaded that he

[1] Mark iii. 23; Matt. xii. 24; Luke xi. 15. [2] Mark iii. 21.

should be arrested for their own safety and the safety of others. It is only the older tradition that has preserved for us this remarkable fact; the later tradition has, out of other and nearer considerations, passed it by; only in the fourth Gospel[1] is there a trace of it, with the change, however, that it was not the relatives of Jesus but the "Jews" who charged him with being insane.

But before it was possible for the relatives of Jesus to go from Nazareth to Capernaum and there obtain possession of his person, an affair took place between Jesus and certain Scribes sent from Jerusalem to Capernaum to prepare the way, we may suppose, for a legal examination. These persons pressed with the crowd into his dwelling as spies upon his proceedings. They had artfully sown the suspicion here and there of his having formed a league with the Prince of the Demons, and Jesus, aware of their plots, challenged them at once publicly to answer for the calumny. First of all he exposed the direct and flat contradiction involved in their malicious charge. All that he was doing lay there open before the eyes of all men. The purpose of all was plainly to be seen. Was it not his single aim, out of the fulness of divine power, to do battle with the evil spirits of the time, to conquer all that was wicked and hurtful, to restore soundness of mind and health to the people? That he willed what was good and labored for the same with all his strength, who dared to deny? And to secure what was good was it to be conceived that he had entered into alliance with the Prince of Darkness? What an absurd, suicidal idea! to conquer evil with evil, to employ the weapons of darkness to overthrow the empire

[1] John x. 19.

of darkness![1] No kingdom is at war with itself, or if it admits division, then is it already on the way to ruin, then it can do no more harm; it is tending swiftly to destruction. Jesus had engaged in a stern and radical conflict with the empire of the Evil One, he had vanquished the Prince of Darkness, he had bound him: how could Jesus be bound to him and by him?

The vindication of Jesus was so complete, that the theologues, caught in their own snares, found themselves forced to hold their peace. He was thus in a position all the more favorable to assume the offensive. They thought themselves the "righteous" of the land, and were tangled inextricably in the net of sin. Jesus had come offering forgiveness to sinners, desirous, not of condemning the guilty but of delivering them. But in the bosom of the opposing party, among the representatives of the privileged classes, the hierarchs and theologians, he had met with such a degree of spiritual pride and moral obduracy, as, according to his ideas, destroyed all sense of the need of forgiveness, and consequently forgiveness itself was no longer possible. This sin of theological obduracy he designated as the sin against the Holy Spirit. The holy and regenerating spirit in which Jesus was forming his Communion of disciples, contending with selfishness and ambition, alleviating the miseries of the people, and opening to them a better future, the hierarchs pronounced a devilish spirit. In their eyes light was darkness, darkness light. And they had sought to extinguish the source of light by persuading the relatives of Jesus to treat him as one possessed, and to render him harmless by confining him. The greatest

[1] Mark iii. 23.

sin possible, in the estimation of Jesus, is *the wilful and malignant fanaticism that selfishly and blindly opposes all moral and religious progress, and resists all renovation and development within the Church*. This is opposition to the advancing kingdom of God himself. It is not, therefore, in the domain of religion and morality that the greatest sin is possible. It does not consist, as is erroneously supposed, in falling away from a state of conversion to a state of impenitence; it is found, not among so-called infidels and people of the world, but on the contrary, among the strict, stern champions of narrow creeds, among the supporters and representatives of orthodox formalism.

3. Hardly had Jesus dismissed the Scribes, after having, doubtless, embittered them still more against him by the heavy blow which he had dealt them, when his relatives came from Nazareth to his dwelling in their blind zeal to secure his immediate confinement. It is very probable that this movement on their part was instigated by the Scribes sent from Jerusalem. To avoid disturbance they caused Jesus to be called from the house. His refusal to obey the call, rude, as it appears, towards his kindred, we can be at no loss to understand. He owed it to himself, to his honor, to his great work, thus to refuse compliance with their will. After the evil doing attributed to him, he was bound, first of all, to avoid all contact with his relatives. As they had allowed themselves to be used as the willing tools of his cunning opponents in their malignant designs, there was for a time no further bond between him and them. His disciples and his friends among the people, who surrounded him like a protecting wall, took the place of his mother and brothers, who, caught in the snares of an evil power, had come

to lay hands upon him and put an end to his work. He had formed a new family in which he presided as spiritual head; his aim was to enlarge it through the power of his word and spirit, that it might become the great household of God, embracing all mankind.

That from the time he delivered his initiatory discourse to his disciples he extended his views beyond Israel over the Gentile world, is not to be doubted. What was there to prevent him from taking all men into his regard, Gentiles as well as Jews, and looking upon them all as members of his Communion, when he had once declared the conditions of participation in the kingdom of God to be founded on inward, moral distinctions? "Whosoever doeth the will of God, he is my brother, sister, mother,"[1] said he to those who wondered at his refusal to go with his relatives, — 'doing the will of God:' a word presenting a sharp contrast with 'doing the will of mere men, of the priests and the powerful.' The will of God is the central idea of all that is true, good, holy. Among the theocratic statutes that idea lay buried in the shroud of theological bigotry and priestly prejudice.

4. The kingdom that Jesus had founded in the form of an association of his disciples, and had publicly announced in his preliminary discourse, the hierarchs called the kingdom of the Devil. In opposition to this shameful calumny, it was incumbent upon Jesus thoroughly to set forth and make evident the character of his kingdom. And now, in the presence of the people, excited against him partly by the malignity of the Jewish teachers, he placed in a clear light, in a series of propositions, the nature and essential character of his kingdom. In illustration of his meaning, he

[1] Mark iii. 35; Matt. xii. 50; Luke viii. 21.

adopted the mode of teaching by comparisons. The point of these comparisons he explained in private to his disciples with distinct reference to their Apostolic calling. Three of these similitudes the oldest tradition has recorded as specially noteworthy, the similitudes of the sower,[1] of the self-growing seed,[2] and of the mustard seed.[3] These form a group by itself. They represent the kingdom of God in its origin, in its growth, and in its consummation.

It has its origin in the Word.[4] The words "of God" in the third Gospel are a later addition. The Word, as the personally immediate element, moral and spiritual, stands in opposition to tradition and mere official and historical authority. But the Word in itself does not suffice; there is need in addition of a good soil, of the open, susceptible, loving and believing human heart. The kingdom of God is grounded therefore in both: in the eternal truth of the divine spirit, and in the personal openness of the human heart. In the most sacred deep, in the divine centre of all truth, man must first strike his roots; but not by prescription nor by force, but only by trust and love can he be brought into vital communion with God.

The growth of the kingdom is not promoted by mechanical means and external agencies. From within outwardly comes the germinating life of the Communion of God. It contains its own destiny, which it accomplishes even when it is only not obstructed in its development by art and violence.

Finally, a consummation the most comprehensive

[1] Mark iv. 3–20; Matt. xiii. 3–23; Luke viii. 4–13.
[2] Mark iv. 16–20. This passage appears only in Mark.
[3] Mark iv. 30; Matt. xiii. 31; Luke xiii. 18.
[4] Mark iv. 14; Matt. xiii. 19.

and exalted awaits the kingdom of God. No other association is to be compared with it in this respect, — so small and unpretending in its beginning, so great and glorious in its final unfolding. It comprehends all mankind.

The three similitudes of the second Gospel grow to seven in the first Gospel, whose reports are less simple and of a later origin. The five additional comparisons found in this Gospel can hardly be supposed to have been made by Jesus at the same time with the other three. It is natural to imagine that Jesus intended, first of all, to describe the kingdom of God established by him, in the three essential periods of its origin, its growth, and its final development. The similitudes of the tares,[1] of the leaven,[2] of the treasure hid in the field,[3] of the pearl of great price,[4] of the net,[5] point to a period in which the Community, founded by Jesus, was already overtaken by the process of sifting and separation, and the last crisis was approaching.

NOTE.

[The foregoing chapter is more ingenious than satisfactory. The idea of collusion between the relatives of Jesus and the Scribes and Pharisees from Jerusalem is by no means required by the circumstances or authorized by the records. That Jesus, after having spent his life till he was thirty years of age in the seclusion of a private and humble sphere, should suddenly go forth into the world and there be found collecting great crowds around him and producing great excitement, was certainly a circumstance fitted to awaken in the minds of his kindred, who did not understand him, the suspicion that he did not know what he was about, — that he was "beside himself." It is not at all

[1] Matt. xiii. 24–30. [2] Matt. xiii. 33. [3] Matt. xiii. 44.
[4] Matt. xiii. 45. [5] Matt. xiii. 47.

necessary to suppose that this suspicion came from any outside suggestion. That with this apprehension the mother of Jesus should induce his brothers to go with her and try to persuade him to leave the crowd and go home with her is equally natural. Although it does not appear from the narrative that he complied with her wishes immediately, neither does it require us to believe that he distinctly refused to see his relatives or to go with them upon that occasion.

Our author may be justified in regarding the second Gospel as the Gospel that, on the whole, most accurately reflects the truth. We are inclined to think that he is. Nevertheless, there are cases in which the internal historical evidence preponderates in favor of one or another of the other Gospels. The present is, we think, one of them. Of the three passages upon which the foregoing chapter is based (Matth. xii. 22 – 50, Mark iii. 20 – 35, Luke xi. 14 – 32), the passage in Matthew appears to us to present the most natural, vivid, and lifelike picture of this portion of the history of Jesus. Let us observe what this Gospel states.

On a certain occasion, Matthew tells us, a man was brought to Jesus blind and dumb. According to the established belief of the times, the nervous disease, causing in this person the loss of sight and of speech, was supposed to be a malignant spiritual influence. However these infirmities were caused, Jesus relieved the man, and so strikingly was the cure effected that the people who witnessed it were filled with astonishment, and some exclaimed, "Is not this the Son of David?" in other words, "the Messiah?" It was believed that the Messiah would be a descendant of the most illustrious of their ancient kings. When the Pharisees, who were in the crowd, heard what was said, they were outraged to the last degree. What profanation, what blasphemy this! to call this low Nazarene, the associate of the abandoned and vile, this Sabbath-breaker, whom nobody knew anything about, – to suggest the idea that he could be that great personage, the magnificent, sacred Messiah! It was insufferable. These Pharisees had witnessed the wonder, — had seen the man restored to sight and speech. They could not deny the fact. But the fatal impression it was producing must be destroyed, or there was no telling what might come of it. Something must be done. There was but one explanation to be given. It must be the Devil that helped Jesus. He must be in league with the Evil One. He could have wrought such a cure only by the as-

sistance of the very Prince of evil spirits. This suggestion, I conceive, was not so much a charge, as Dr. Schenkel thinks, deliberately made against Jesus as a last desperate pretext to which the Pharisees were driven to have recourse. It was all they could say. They said it without thinking what an admission it involved. It was a virtual confession that Jesus evinced a more than human power. How deeply he was shocked at the depravity which such a calling of good evil revealed, is seen by what followed. He instantly poured forth in a variety of arguments an overwhelming demonstration of the absurdity and wickedness of charging him with being in league with evil spirits because he cast out evil spirits. "Is the Evil One," he says in effect, "working through me to overthrow his own kingdom? Every kingdom, city, or house, divided against itself must come to ruin. No one can despoil a strong man unless he has first bound the strong man. If I cast out the evil spirits who are the servants of the Prince of evil spirits, then is the power of God working through me. If I cast them out by the power of the Evil One by whom do 'your children,' that is, those whom you patronize (the professional exorcists of the day), cast them out? The common proverb, 'He that is not with me is against me,' teaches you better. I am not *with* the Evil One, I am not doing evil, his work, and therefore, according to the proverb, the conclusion must be that I am against him. You admit that this power of mine is above the power of man. You see that it does not injure but bless, and yet you say it is not of God but of the Evil One. You blaspheme. You call good evil. It is unpardonable. There is no hope of you. You might be pardoned for speaking against me, a man, but when the beneficent power of God is right before you, unmistakably, and you call it an evil power, what can move you? You are past forgiveness, because you are past repentance and conviction. There is no hope of you now or ever." Such, I conceive, was the purport of what Jesus is recorded to have said on this occasion. He had no thought of saying that there is any penitent who will not be forgiven, or that there is any sin that, being repented of and forsaken, will not be pardoned. But, shocked in the extreme at the incorrigible depravity of mind shown in these men who denounced as the very spirit of all evil what they confessed to be superhuman power and what was purely beneficent, Jesus uttered on this occasion the strong and unqualified language in which deep feeling always expresses

itself. It never pauses to guard and qualify. It delights in general and universal terms. "But O you brood of serpents!" he virtually goes on to say, "what else could be expected of you? How can you, being so corrupt, say anything else? Out of the rank abundance of evil in your hearts your mouths speak. There can come no good fruit from a bad tree."

It appears from what followed, according to the first Gospel, that some of the Pharisees, if not the very individuals who thus blasphemed, inveterate as their perversity was, were somewhat impressed on this occasion, for they came to Jesus, and in terms of personal respect addressing him as "Teacher," asked him to give them a sign of his authority. It seems to have been expected by the Jews that the Messiah, when he should appear, would give a sign or signal by which all would recognize him at once as the Messiah beyond the possibility of mistake. What the precise nature of the sign was to be we do not know. The Jews themselves, I suppose, had no definite idea of it. It was to be, we may believe, some imposing visible demonstration of supernatural power corresponding to the popular idea of the Messiah as a king. Some miraculous display of this sort the Pharisees asked of Jesus. And in asking for it, they showed that they were not altogether unmoved by what Jesus had done. It is as if they said, "Master, you certainly are no common person; you do very wonderful things. Now give us a sign, and we will acknowledge your authority." In reply, Jesus said that no sign would be given them such as they required. And then he proceeded to compare the moral condition of these men to the case of a demoniac, an illustration suggested probably by the instance of demoniacal possession which he had just relieved. When a man was subject to fits of mania that recurred with increasing violence, it was the belief of the times that he was under the influence of an evil spirit that, leaving him when the paroxysm of the disease subsided, went away to "dry places," (that is, to arid, lonely deserts which were supposed to be the abodes of evil spirits,) seeking a habitation there, but in its restlessness finding none, consorted with other evil spirits worse than itself, and came back to the man, bringing those other evil spirits with it, and re possessed him, and thus the increased violence of the disease was accounted for. The idea that deserts and forests are the habitations of demons is a natural superstition, and was by no means confined to the Jews It prevails among ignorant and barbarous

nations. It is found at the present day among the savage tribes in the interior of Africa. The number *seven* ("seven other spirits") was used indefinitely by the Jews.

We entirely misapprehend Jesus in this passage if we understand him as intending to affirm the existence of evil spirits and to communicate information regarding them. He merely avails himself of the universal belief to illustrate the moral condition of those Pharisees who, in their madness, first accused him of being in league with the Evil One, and then in a saner moment asked for a sign, intimating that it was all that they needed. They are, he says, like one possessed. They appear for the time to be recovering their moral sanity. The depraved spirit that possesses them seems to have left them, but it will return with sevenfold fury, and their condition will be worse than ever.

While Jesus "yet talked to the people" and was profoundly engrossed with what he was saying, some one broke in upon him, rudely interrupting him and calling out that his mother was there, with his brothers, outside the crowd, unable to get to him and wanting to speak with him. (The "people were gathered thick together," Luke states, on this occasion. Ch. xi. 29.) His relatives came, it is natural to suppose, anxious on his account to persuade him to go with them, to withdraw him from a scene of excitement and danger. They perceived what formidable enemies he was making. But so absorbed was he in the scene, that he had forgotten himself and all the usual relations of life. And therefore upon being thus abruptly called to himself and to his personal ties, he expresses himself as if no such things were. "Who is my mother! Who are my brothers!" he exclaimed. He could not instantly recover himself. And have we not here an exquisite touch of nature? Has not the soul affinities more intimate and sacred than the ties of nature and of blood? With equal truth of nature does Jesus immediately explain himself. Turning and pointing to those around him who were listening breathlessly to every word that was falling from his lips, he exclaimed, "Behold my mother and my brothers!" And here (Luke xi. 27, 28) occurred an incident in wonderful keeping with the scene. Upon mention being made of his mother, a woman in the crowd, moved, fascinated by his presence and his power, cried out, "Blessed is she that bore thee and the breasts that gave thee nourishment!" How naturally does his reply to this woman betray his annoyance at having had his attention

and the attention of the people so abruptly diverted from the weighty thoughts that had his whole mind at the time. He turned to the woman and said, "Blessed rather are they who hear the word of God and keep it!" here again showing his emotion in the use of universal terms, while the woman doubtless shrunk back from his words as aimed directly at herself, and as rebuking her for thinking of anything but what he was saying. "Whosoever will do the will of my Father who is in heaven," he adds, "the same is my brother and *sister* and mother," — the allusion to the *sisterly* relation being suggested by the woman.

We submit that the foregoing exposition of this portion of the history not only shows how little foundation there is for the supposition that the relatives of Jesus were the tools of the Pharisees, but is in itself most natural. Does it not overflow with the life of truth and nature? — TRANS.]

CHAPTER X.

THE DISCIPLES TRIED AND SENT FORTH.

1. AFTER the bold assault made upon his honor and personal liberty by his nearest relatives, and the slanderous suspicions in regard to his character and work spread abroad by the hierarchical party, Jesus again determined to leave Capernaum for a time. He resolved to go to the eastern shore of the Lake of Gennesaret, desiring especially to withdraw from the increasing excitement caused by the conflicting opinions concerning him, which had probably extended to the abodes of the humblest of the people. He wished also to bring his disciples acquainted with a wider sphere of life and action, and gradually prepare them for the independent discharge of their work as missionaries of the divine kingdom. How lacking they were in strength of character, a trial near at hand was to show. Overcome with the excitement and labors of days and

nights previous, Jesus fell asleep in the vessel which was bearing him to the eastern shore of the lake. While he slept, there arose on the usually calm surface of the lake a storm that lashed the waves with such violence, that they broke over the vessel, which was not sufficiently protected against so furious a commotion of the waters. The disciples, although experienced sailors, lost their presence of mind. In their fright they roused their master from his sleep, unacquainted as he was with the management of the vessel. They were amazed at his composure. He remained calm. He stood among those seafaring men, who in this instance had lost heart, with a presence of mind and self-command that inspired them with awe. What kept his mind so composed in such a perilous moment? It was not that iron hardness of temperament, which under all circumstances faces death with indifference, — nothing of this sort can be attributed to Jesus, — but it was his immovable faith in his destiny, his unwavering conviction that his hour had not yet come, that he must do the great work of his life, and that the accident of a storm could not disturb the divine plan for the salvation of mankind. According to the evangelical tradition, Jesus conjured the storm, and at his word the tumultuous waves subsided.[1] But such a sudden and direct interference with natural events, connected as they are by a regular and established order, is possible only to Omnipotence. It is not in the power of the human will to command storms and waves; the idea of a moral influence acting upon the storm-tost lake is not to be entertained. If Jesus ruled nature with divine omnipotence, then was this authority without any moral significance, and his per-

[1] Mark iv. 39; Matt. viii. 26; Luke viii. 24.

son was in this case an altogether superhuman appearance, *un*representative, unapproachable. How much more elevated is the idea of Jesus, standing there amidst the increasing danger surrounded by the trembling seafarers, in spite of the despair of the steersman, — standing there in holy self-possession, commanding, rebuking, encouraging, an image of perfect faith in God and of the clearest foresight of his destiny! He made indeed upon this occasion the sad discovery how little he could depend upon his disciples, upon their presence of mind, or strength of character; for he who cannot command his fears in a storm upon the lake to which he is used, — how will he bear himself when the storms of persecution arise and the waves of hostile passion rage around him?

2. In contrast and comparison with the storm on the lake, a storm of another kind is represented in a mind diseased, in the case of the man met by Jesus east of the Jordan, whose cure is related by the first three Evangelists.[1] Scarcely had Jesus happily landed from the storm-threatened vessel, when this man, a maniac of the fiercest description, flung himself before him.[2] He had fled from the habitations of men, and taken up his abode among mouldering gravestones. When the fit was on him, no chain could hold him, no human strength master him. His cries at that season were frightful, and he wreaked his frenzy on his own person, gashing himself with stones: — a side-piece to the wild storm on the lake, — a storm in a human soul. The unhappy man had heard of the approach of Jesus, whose way led near him. How could Jesus pass him by with-

[1] Mark v. 1; Matt. viii. 28; Luke viii. 26.

[2] In the first Gospel, chap. viii. 18, two maniacs are mentioned, an exaggeration, probably, of a later tradition, for the purpose of magnifying the marvel.

out sympathy? He determined instantly to deliver him from his terrible affliction, to lay the storm within. It would seem that the man himself had no wish to be relieved, that imagining that he saw in Jesus only a tormenting spirit, he desired his instant departure. But as he addressed Jesus as "the Son of the Most High," and (although ambiguously) manifested a recognition of the high office of Jesus, he showed that there was that in him by means of which Jesus could exercise a healing influence upon him. He therefore cured him thoroughly, — and the legend describes the violent paroxysm, which, preceding the cure, startled a herd of swine and caused them to rush into the water, as a demoniacal manifestation, — the demons driven from the man being supposed to be sent into those unclean animals, so odious to the Jews. Apart from these legendary accretions, the narrative is in substance entirely credible, and it has also a deep and worthy significance. The disciples who had just been so appalled by the storm on the lake, were now brought acquainted with a storm in the soul. They who had been full of admiration at their Master's fearlessness in a storm in the outer world, were now to learn to admire his art in laying the inner storm of madness and subduing its wildest frenzy by the pure power of his spirit. We understand that during this startling scene the disciples spoke not a word. They all had cause for reflection in shame and silence. How little had they shown themselves equal to the Apostolic office! How confused and uncertain were they in their own minds!

And now new trials were at hand. At the outset of his career, universal confidence, popularity almost unbounded and often oppressive, had been accorded their Master; the people had besieged his dwelling

and crowded round his person. But since his encounter with the Jewish hierarchs and theologues, since his difficulties with his relatives and the calumny whispered against him on all sides, the feeling of many of his hitherto friends and adherents among the people had undergone no inconsiderable change. The poison of distrust and suspicion had dropped into hearts previously unsuspecting. Even beyond the Jordan evil reports had spread; here for the first time Jesus was met by a dislike of his person and his work. The destruction of the swine, the loss of which had enraged their owners, was what especially moved the people of Gadara, the chief town of Peræa, to refuse to receive him. The belief that he used devilish arts in relieving the possessed filled weak minds with terror. He was forced to leave that region at once, although he had but just arrived there and needed rest. For the first time the disciples had now before their eyes an instance of that incorrigible unbelief, which they were compelled so often to meet at a still later period. Although denied the opportunity of publishing the Gospel in the land of the ten cities on the eastern side of the Lake of Gennesaret, he could still rejoice in being able to leave behind him the man he had healed, a sincere and grateful convert, a germ of future development.[1]

3. Again Jesus returned across the lake to the neighborhood of Capernaum. But things had so changed there, that he could not make up his mind to any lengthened sojourn in that place. He did not, however, withdraw his helping hand from the city, whose faith in him was now wavering. The daughter of one of the rulers of the synagogue, Jairus, lay at

[1] Mark v. 19; Luke viii. 38.

the point of death. When Jesus, whose aid was solicited, reached the dwelling of Jairus, the girl was supposed by those around her to be already dead. But, as the words, "she is not dead," found in all the first three Gospels, show that she was still living, Jesus was able by his help-bringing presence to restore her. In the despair of Jairus, as in the fright of the disciples in the storm on the lake, the poor weak human heart is visible, so soon giving way in trouble, through lack of submission and trust in God magnifying the real danger, and losing courage and hope in the hour of need. The disciples had cause to see themselves mirrored in Jairus; his state of mind was a companion-piece of theirs in the storm. All the more had they occasion now to rely upon the presence of mind and holy composure of their Master, who, not allowing himself to be disturbed by the lamentations of the afflicted household, saw things in their true light, gave help at the right moment, and revived the child to the comfort and joy of those who had too soon fallen to lamenting her.

In the mean time, as Jesus was on his way to the house of Jairus, an incident occurred which presented a most humbling contrast to the unbelief of the Gadarenes and the weak faith of the disciples, in the child-like pious faith of a suffering woman, who, unable in the crowd to obtain an interview with Jesus, in her faith in his healing power caught hold of his garments, and felt herself instantly restored to health. Thus mightily was she affected by the excitement of religious feeling.[1] We can conceive of no other way in which her cure was caused. The supposition that it was due to a medical virtue in the clothes of Jesus not

[1] Mark v. 25; Matt. ix. 20; Luke viii. 43.

only changes the healing power of Jesus into magic, it contradicts what he said to the woman, and which is certainly not to be disregarded: "Woman, thy *faith* hath saved thee."[1]

4. In this way there passed before the eyes of the Apostles, before they went forth on their missionary travels, a series of instructive instances of unbelief, of the weakness and also of the strength of faith. But it was unbelief especially, the one great obstacle which they were to meet, that they were yet to learn to know in a form more hostile and dismaying than they had yet seen it. Jesus had not yet, as we know, publicly appeared in his native place, Nazareth. He had, from the beginning of his public labors, taken up his abode in Capernaum. Was he then to make no attempt to gather friends of God in his native town? The difficulty of any such attempt there was certainly great. There dwelt his nearest relatives, who pronounced him insane and would fain get possession of his person. When such was the disposition of his kindred towards him, what was to be expected of those who stood personally at a distance from him? In the opinion of all such, he was at least a dangerous agitator, disturbing the peace of Israel. But it was not for him to spare himself and his disciples any trial however severe, from fear of threatening obstacles. He went on a certain Sabbath with his disciples to Nazareth, appearing openly in the midst of its ill-disposed inhabitants; he proceeded directly to the synagogue, but met there with the most determined opposition. Most of his hearers were filled with contempt and scorn.[2] They gave vent to their feelings, although not without hesitation. They did not venture to say

[1] Mark v. 34; Matt. ix. 22; Luke viii. 48. [2] Mark vi. 2.

openly that they believed him to be in league with the Prince of Darkness, but they intimated as much in the words: "Whence came such wisdom to such a man, whence has he obtained such gifts?" They called to mind his low origin, the carpenter's trade which he had learned in his youth,[1] his family, his relatives, who were in no wise distinguished, and who themselves had no great idea of him. He could not possibly, in their opinion, have gained his knowledge and art by any lawful means, in any ordinary way. He must be in alliance with unlawful powers. Cause enough to regard him with distrust.[2] This hostile attitude of the people of Nazareth towards Jesus left in the Apostolic community so deep an impression that even the fourth Gospel (although in a different connection) has preserved a report of it.[3] But in this Gospel what could be true only of Nazareth is referred to all Galilee. It was not merely in a general way that Jesus applies to himself the proverb: "A prophet is not without honor save in his own country and among his own kindred and in his own house."[4] He spoke of himself from the bitter experience of the moment. He styled himself a "prophet"; for he had not then arrived at the conviction of being, in a new and higher sense of the word, the fulfiller of the yet unaccomplished Messianic promise of the Old Testament.

Notwithstanding his painful experience in his native town, a new and instructive light is thrown upon the nature of his healing power. When his teaching was met by such unconquerable resistance, as in Nazareth, his healing power could not act. It was, from

[1] Mark vi. 3; Matt. xiii. 35.
[2] Mark vi. 3; Matt. xiii. 57.
[3] John iv. 43.
[4] Mark vi. 4; Matt. xiii. 57; John iv. 44.

the very nature of the case, dependent upon the moral susceptibility of the persons healed. This is the reason why only a very few sick people received help from him in Nazareth.[1]

The disciples had now been put to the test in a variety of ways. They were made to feel their moral wants, their weaknesses, cowardice, and how little they were to be relied upon. They were thus brought to that humble frame of mind which alone qualifies men for the discharge of the more arduous tasks of life. These tasks they were now to undertake. Still under the oversight and guidance of Jesus, they were, first in the immediate vicinity, to apply themselves courageously and cheerfully to the work of spreading the kingdom of God. They were now to step out from the position of submissive pupils, wholly dependent, and become fellow-laborers with Jesus; and not upon the good ground where the seed was already sown, but upon the hard, beaten highway, upon stony soil, overgrown with thorns. In Gadara and Nazareth they had been made acquainted with the two different forms of unbelief: in the former place, with the unbelief of vulgar, natural selfishness, in the latter, with the unbelief of proud, perverse fanaticism. After prolonged wanderings and continued trials, Jesus now considered the Twelve sufficiently prepared to labor by themselves for the cause of his kingdom. They were first sent forth into different parts of Judea. Their work was not directly to proclaim Jesus as the Messiah and to proceed to the establishment of the Messiah's kingdom; the commission they received was

[1] It is highly probably that the account, given in a wrong connection by Luke (iv. 28), of an attempt upon the life of Jesus, is one of the later legends. Consult Mark vi. 5; Matt. xiii. 58, the correct account.

to gather the well disposed in Israel into a new Communion, to offer, after the example of Jesus, a helping hand to the suffering, and to continue the conflict with the evil spirits, by which the people and especially their leaders, were blinded and fettered.[1]

Jesus showed admirable wisdom in the sending forth of his disciples. First of all, he did not send them out singly but always two together, for they were to be accustomed to work in brotherly fellowship, and when difficulties arose, one was to have at hand the counsel and aid of the other. Nothing is more hurtful to the purposes of the divine kingdom than separation, self-will, self-conceit. A peculiar mode of journeying was prescribed by Jesus to the Apostles. A staff was allowed them,[2] but neither provisions nor money, nothing more than an under-coat. It became a laborer for the kingdom of God to go forth with the greatest possible simplicity, renouncing all comforts not absolutely indispensable. Through needless burdens the disciples would only have been impeded in their activity. Even for the simple means of sustaining life they were to trust in God and in the hospitality of friends and brothers in the faith. Jesus gave them particular instructions as to their personal intercourse with men. They were not to be careless in this respect. Where they were kindly received in a family, there were they to remain till they left the place; where personal kindness was refused them, they were not to attempt to abide, but shake off the very dust of the place from their feet. The stern word that it would be more tolerable for Sodom and Gomorrah in the day of judg-

[1] Mark vi. 7; Matt. x. 1; Luke ix. 1.

[2] Mark (vi. 8) is to be followed here rather than Matt. x. 10 and Luke ix. 3.

ment than for the city which should refuse to receive the Apostolic preaching, belongs in all probability to the later tradition.[1] It not only does not agree with the consideration shown by Jesus for those who, from ignorance, rejected the Gospel, but it is also irreconcileable with the teaching of Jesus that the unbeliever carried his condemnation in himself. The fourth Gospel has preserved for us from the later tradition the idea which is in full unison with the spirit of Jesus: "Whosoever believes not is condemned already,"[2] for the unbeliever remains in darkness; he who believes, on the other hand, has communion with the light,[3] and light is life, peace, blessedness.

5. How long the missionary journeys of the disciples lasted is not to be determined with any certainty. That their labors were attended with various results, that, especially by healing the sick (*e.g.*, anointing with oil) they excited attention and awakened an interest in the cause of Jesus is not to be doubted.[4]

In consequence of their activity, accounts of Jesus reached for the first time the ears of Herod Antipas, awakening in his mind no pleasant remembrances. By putting to death the Baptist, this prince had burdened his conscience with the guilt of blood. As the unbelieving often are, he was superstitious, and he was now tortured by the fear that Jesus might be John risen from the grave.[5] Possibly, out of hatred of Jesus the "Herodians" encouraged these dark surmises in the soul of the suspicious prince.

The period had now arrived when, in various inter-

[1] Matt. x. 15.

[2] John iii. 18. [But these are the words, not of Jesus, but of the author of the fourth Gospel. — TRANS.]

[3] John iii. 21.

[4] Mark vi. 13; Luke ix. 6.

[5] Mark vi. 14; Matt. xiv. 2; Luke ix. 7.

ested quarters, definite opinions had to be formed concerning Jesus and his designs. Up to this hour the idea entertained of his person and purposes had been very confused. The supposition that he was the Baptist risen from the dead could occur only to a guilty mind like Herod's. Not more rationally did they judge who declared that Jesus was Elias. John and Elias were in their whole spirit and style men of tradition, men of the past, while Jesus, not directly indeed, yet in his initiatory discourse, had indicated the formation of a new Covenant as his great aim. They were of clearer vision who welcomed in Jesus a seer, a "prophet," although, even in this character, they hardly conceived of him as on an equality with the illustrious prophets of the olden time. Up to this hour Jesus himself had kept silent in regard to the significance of his person and his work. While his disciples were away, he withdrew, we suppose, into solitude. New spiritual conflicts, new temptations and struggles were to be met. He needed therefore to collect and strengthen himself anew. Upon hearing of the return of the Apostles, he went to meet them on the shore of the Lake, and again retired with them. He wished to hear in private from their own lips what they had learned and what they had done.[1] It was not until after a prolonged seclusion that he showed himself again to the people, who had missed him greatly. A joyous sensation spread through the neighboring cities of Galilee at the report of his re-appearance. Numbers hastened at once to the point where he was expected. Although this thronging of the people around him was as repugnant to him as ever, and although he had purposely sought retirement with

[1] Mark vi. 30; Luke ix. 10.

his disciples, who had not yet recovered from the fatigue of their journeyings, still, at the sight of the assembled crowds, his compassion would not suffer him to allow them to depart disappointed. He offered them what he saw they specially needed, the bread of heaven, the preaching of the kingdom of God and life eternal.[1] But here, while the Evangelists tell us nothing further of the subjects of his teaching, they lay special stress upon the fact that Jesus fed the hungry, weary multitude, destitute of food, with only five loaves and two fishes. Two of the Evangelists are so impressed with this tradition that they twice relate, in a somewhat different form, what was probably one and the same incident.[2]

It would be a very strange circumstance indeed if so large a multitude, coming together from different quarters to one spot, should have brought with them no food. It is moreover altogether improbable, according to the idea which we have thus far obtained of Jesus, that he should, by an act of divine creative power, increase a quantity of food, only sufficient for a few, to an amount that served to satisfy several thousands. The Almighty himself does not create after this fashion. But, putting out of view the divine method of working in nature, in order to make bread and prepare fish to be eaten there is needed the artificial process of human preparation. Besides, it does not appear on what account precisely such an extraordinary miracle was necessary, if there were money enough in the travelling-bag of Jesus to procure quickly the necessary provisions.[3] It is surprising also that the miracle does not seem to have left any

[1] Mark vi. 34; Luke ix. 11.
[2] Mark viii. 1; Matt. xv. 32.
[3] Mark vi. 37; Matt. xiv. 15.

great impression upon the minds of the people who were thus fed, as they lost all remembrance of it afterwards.

That this incident has, however, an historical foundation is not to be doubted. That it is twice related by two of the Evangelists, and that even the fourth Gospel has it, is proof that it passed in various forms from mouth to mouth in the Apostolic community. How interesting and impressive are the circumstances that form the historical basis of the story! Jesus, after having been for some time buried in still seclusion, anxiously awaiting the issues of the first labors of his Apostles, had just come to greet their return. How much had they to tell him of the remarkable effects of their words and acts! The people at large, interested and curious about him, heard of this important meeting of the Master with the Apostles. For a considerable time now they had received from his lips no word of encouragement or consolation. They come flocking from all quarters to one point, eager for the bread of life, for higher truth. They would fain know something also of the result of the first sending forth of his disciples. Such oral information was doubly valued when there was no other mode of communicating intelligence of remarkable events. The multitude seemed to the Lord like sheep having no shepherd;[1] so much the more deeply did he feel himself called to be their shepherd, to lead them to true and nourishing pastures. Out of the fulness of his mind and heart he spoke to them, and they stood and sat all around him, and in the grace and power of his word they forgot their hunger and thirst. He fed them bountifully with the heavenly bread of life. As moreover he stood

[1] Mark vi. 34.

among them like a patriarch giving them his benediction, as he devoutly offered thanks for the earthly food, produced partly from what they had brought with them and in part hastily procured at the time, and when finally he bade his disciples distribute the food, how easy was it for a later tradition to understand and represent the spiritual refreshment which the people received on this occasion as material food satisfying their physical wants! In the account given in the fourth Gospel, there are intimations that the food was not actually multiplied in the way stated. It is true, even in this Gospel, the greatest importance is attached to the outward miracle, and it was on account of the miracle that the multitude declared Jesus to be "a prophet."[1] But in what Jesus says in regard to the feeding of the multitude, he speaks to those who participated in it as if there had been nothing miraculous, nothing more than ordinary natural refreshment.[2] That Jesus wrought no miracle on this occasion is the more probable, as those, who must have been present then, expressly declare that they had not yet witnessed any miracle wrought by Jesus.[3] And therefore it was that they required him to manifest himself by a "sign," such as was given to the Israelites in the wilderness, in the gift of the manna.[4] Jesus upbraided them for their craving for miracles, and refers them from the miraculous manna, which they asked for, to the spiritual bread of heaven offered them in his person. Whoever comes to him will never hunger, and whoever believes in him will never thirst.[5] This profound discourse concerning the true bread of heaven was, doubtless, in substance, uttered by Jesus. Thus he

[1] John vi. 14. [2] John vi. 25, &c. [3] John vi. 30.
[4] Exod. xvi. 4. [5] John vi. 35.

spoke to the multitude, who in their moral destitution and lack of religious guidance appeared like a flock in the desert without a shepherd, with no strengthening nourishment, no refreshing waters.

What Jesus said to the unbelieving who required a "sign," asking for bread, for manna, shows strikingly that he was neither able nor willing to repeat the Old Testament miracle. He had come for higher purposes. More glorious miracles were to proceed from him. He was not dispensing perishable bread miraculously, from the clouded heaven overhead.[1] From the heaven of his spirit he was giving forth imperishable food. He was giving himself, his flesh and blood, to the world, that it might enjoy life forever.[2] This enigmatical utterance he himself explains; it was not physical but spiritual refreshment that he offered to men, the redeeming power of his personal life, which, in loving self-sacrifice, he was ready to give up for the world,[3] — this was his meaning. While in his discourse to his disciples, Jesus, by a few striking principles, contrasted the new law of the divine kingdom as a law of liberty and of the spirit, with the theocratic law of the letter and of bondage, — in this discourse to the people (John vi. 63), on the other hand, he puts, in opposition to the theocratic life with its externalities and formal restrictions, the new life from God, communicated by him, life emanating from the spirit, the gracious gift of our Heavenly Father, in which all true life must be rooted and grounded. The spirit alone gives life to humanity; only through the life of the spirit, and through every one who possesses and reveals it in himself, is access afforded to the Father. This doctrine of the Spirit and of the Life springing

[1] John vi. 27. [2] John vi. 51. [3] John vi. 52.

from the spirit which alone gives life as it gushes and flows from the immediate fulness of God, — this was the food that refreshed the thousands in the desert.[1]

NOTE.

[In section 3 of the foregoing chapter, the restoration of the young daughter of Jairus is commented upon, but very briefly and unsatisfactorily. Dr. Schenkel thinks the child was not dead and was revived through the timely efforts of the family, cheered and encouraged by Jesus. He finds in the narrative of this event an illustration of human nature in Jairus, the father of the girl, but no illustration of the person of Jesus. He rests his belief in the fact that the child was not dead upon the declaration of Jesus to that effect, — a declaration made before Jesus had seen the child, and consequently before he could have had any direct, personal knowledge of her precise condition. So that when he said that she was not dead, if he meant literally to affirm that she had not breathed her last, his knowledge of the fact was as truly and embarrassingly miraculous as his restoring her to life. The words of Jesus are, "She is not dead *but sleepeth*." Supposing him to have been perfectly confident of his power to recall her to life, then we may understand him to have meant by this declaration that to *him*, in *his* eyes, though she had ceased to breathe, she was only as one that was sleeping. He spoke of Lazarus in the same way (see John xi. 11). So confident was he that she would in a few moments be restored, that he could declare that the family were not to mourn for the child as dead; that she was not dead, as they (the people in the house) conceived of death. Do we receive no impression of the personal greatness of Jesus when he is thus represented as using his wonderful power with no thought of anything but the performance of a simple office of humanity, not only with no idea of self-exhibition, but so expressing himself as to put out of the sight and out of the minds of those around him whatever might seem miraculous in the act, representing himself not as

[1] The statement of the Evangelist (John vi. 59), that this discourse was uttered in the synagogue in Capernaum, rests on a mistake. See App, III. 14, p 194.

recalling the dead but only as awakening one who slept? And all that he is described as doing on this occasion is in perfect keeping with this indifference to the miraculousness of the act. So far from calling attention to what he did, so far from summoning spectators, witnesses, "he put them all out," and took the father and mother of the maiden and the two or three of his own disciples who were with him into the chamber where she was lying. And there he practises no mummery, makes use of no incantations, but simply takes the child by the hand and in simple, natural terms and in a commanding tone bids her rise. Does any incident of his history more truly illustrate a transcendent greatness of mind in Jesus, exercising as he does here the most wonderful power with an utter unconsciousness of it, which I can characterize as nothing less than sublime? If the story were a fiction it could owe its origin only to the love of the marvellous. But wherein does it gratify that passion? It sinks the miraculous out of sight. Jesus is represented as speaking and acting as if there were nothing at all wonderful in the case. Was it, still supposing it to be a fiction, designed to show with what lofty indifference to the extraordinary power exercised Jesus could perform so great an act? Why then is not a word pointed in this direction? Why is not this trait made more conspicuous? The narrative breathes throughout that perfect simplicity of truth and nature, which no art or artifice can imitate. And I accept it as a fragment of pure history, not for the sake of any dogmatic use that may be made of it, theological or philosophical, but solely because, so far from marring, it exemplifies the unequalled moral greatness of Jesus.

How comes it that Mark's account of this incident has preserved for us the words, in which Jesus addressed the child, in the very dialect which he used? Surely this is a question well fitted to awaken the curiosity of the critical inquirer. *Talitha cumi*, why were these words, perfectly translatable and immediately translated (*Damsel, I say unto thee, arise!*) preserved in the narrative? There must have been some reason for it. I can conceive of none but that, uttered with the thrilling tone of a faith such as those present had never before witnessed, and instantly followed by the most astonishing effect, they sank at once, the very sound and form of them, into the minds of those who heard them, as words of singular and magical power, to which all other articulations, however significant of the same meaning, seemed

weak, ineffective. As the proximate cause of the revival of the child there was felt to be an untranslatable efficacy in them.

In his notice of the visit of Jesus to his native town in this same section, Dr. Schenkel discredits as a "later legend" the account given of it in the third Gospel, and he appears to have been led to do so by the difficulty of explaining the hostile feeling of the townsmen of Jesus towards him, except by supposing that their minds had been poisoned by the rumor spread abroad at a later period by the Pharisees that Jesus was in league with evil spirits. But there is nothing in Luke's account that intimates the existence of any such suspicion on the part of the Nazarenes. They appear merely to have entertained that narrow and contemptuous idea of him which familiarity with the homely circumstances of his early life had generated in their minds, and which is so natural in such cases as to have given rise to the proverb which Jesus so pertinently quoted on the occasion. That what he said in the synagogue should have filled all present with "wrath" and caused them to threaten his life, was very natural, when the purport of his discourse is considered. He quoted the Scriptures to prove that, on more occasions than one, God had favored Gentiles to the neglect of the descendants of Abraham. What greater insult could be offered to a Jewish auditory! It was in their eyes a profanation of the Scriptures, every letter of which, as the Jews read them, proclaimed their own people the elect of God, and Gentiles no better than dogs in comparison: nothing less than downright blasphemy so to pervert the teachings of Holy Writ. What wonder is it that they meditated hurling him down headlong from the brow of the hill whereon the place was built? In the confusion of the moment, before they could take measures to fulfil the murderous purpose, he slipped away. I am inclined to think that Luke is correct in assigning this incident to an early period in the career of Jesus, shortly after his townsmen had heard of what had occurred in the synagogue at Capernaum. — TRANS.]

APPENDIX.

CRITICAL AND HISTORICAL ILLUSTRATIONS.

APPENDIX.

ILLUSTRATIONS.

1. p. 25. That we possess in the Gospel of Mark the composition lying nearest to the scene of the history of the Redeemer, is now a tolerably sure result of the Inquiry into the origin of the Gospels, and a result of very considerable weight in favor of the historical credibility of the evangelical narrative. *Papias*, Bishop of Hierapolis, in a fragment of his Λογίων κυριακῶν ἐξήγησις, preserved by *Eusebius*,[1] mentions the *Presbyter John*, who was not indeed an Apostle, but a contemporary and pupil of the Apostles. Papias had learned from the Presbyter John that Mark was an "ἑρμηνευτής" of the Apostle Peter and carefully wrote down what was impressed upon his memory by Peter, both the sayings and the acts of Jesus, only not in chronological order (οὐ μέντοι τάξει). The Presbyter John added:[2] Mark never heard the Lord himself, nor had he been a follower of his, but after the death of Jesus he attached himself to Peter, who delivered his discourses with reference to the needs of his hearers and not in any historical order (ὥσπερ σύνταξιν τῶν κυριακῶν ποιούμενος λογίων). Mark therefore has committed no error in recording some things as they were impressed on his memory. One thing only has he been careful about, neither to omit nor to falsify anything that he had heard.

There is no reason to doubt this report which Papias, a man weak, it is true, but of good character, had ob-

[1] Hist. Eccles. III. 40.

[2] *Tholuck* (Glaubwürdigkeit der ev. Geschichte, p. 243) erroneously takes the words quoted above for the words of Papias. They are a continuation of the statement of John.

tained from a contemporary and pupil of the Apostles themselves. Later statements concerning the relation of the second Gospel to John Mark in like manner assume the authenticity of the same. *Irenæus* designates Mark as *interpres et sectator Petri*,[1] and mentions a party that preferred his Gospel to the other Gospels.[2] *Tertullian*, in consequence of the relation of Mark to Peter, refers the second Gospel directly to the authority of Peter: *Marcus quod edidit Evangelium, Petri affirmatur*, in the same way in which he refers the Gospel of Luke to Paul: *nam et Lucae digestum Paulo adscribere solent.*[3] *Clement of Alexandria*, according to a report in Eusebius,[4] in his "Hypotyposes" placed the origin of Mark's Gospel in Rome and connected it with the labors of Peter in that city. At the urgent desire of the hearers of Peter, Mark, according to Clement of Alexandria, wrote down the substance of the preaching of this Apostle without being either required or forbidden to do it by Peter, although Peter had knowledge of Mark's work (ὅπερ ἐπιγνόντα τὸν Πέτρον προτρεπτικῶς μήτε κωλῦσαι μήτε προτρέψασθαι). According to another report in Eusebius,[5] contradicting this, Peter not only approved the work of Mark but encouraged him with his authority, and Mark is even said to have preached the Gospel, which he wrote, in Egypt and to have founded churches in Alexandria.[6] *Jerome* has in his way combined these statements.[7]

John Mark, according to the notices of him in the New Testament, was born in Jerusalem, of Jewish descent, and converted by Peter,[8] who was well known in the house of Mark's mother, where the Christians were wont regularly to meet. At a later period, Mark connected himself with Barnabas and Paul, whom he accompanied to Antioch[9] upon their first missionary journey,[10] only, however, as far as Perga, where he left them and returned to Jerusalem.[11] His

[1] Adv. Haer. III. 10, 6. [2] L. c. III. 11, 7. [3] Adv. Marc. IV. 5.
[4] Hist. Eccles. VI. 14. [5] L. c. II. 15. [6] L. c. II. 16.
[7] Catal. Script. Eccles. 18. [8] Acts xii. 12. [9] Acts xii. 25.
[10] Acts xiii. 5. [11] Acts xiii. 13.

relations to Paul were disturbed by this early withdrawal from the missionary field, indicative of a want of due zeal; and he therefore attached himself more closely to Barnabas, whose nephew he was.[1] Coming to an understanding, however, after some time with Paul and receiving from him instructions for the church at Colosse,[2] he proved himself to be useful.[3] After the death of Paul, he appears to have attached himself again to Peter, and to have spent the time between his rupture with Paul and his restoration to the good graces of that Apostle, partly with Barnabas, partly in the neighborhood of Peter. The close connection of his family with Peter, and the fact that he was an immediate pupil of Peter being considered,[4] nothing was more natural than that, after his breach with Paul, he should connect himself again with Peter, especially as his home was in Jerusalem. According to a later account[5] he went with Peter to Babylon, and was there regarded as his "spiritual son," in very intimate relations with him.

But the question now is, When did he write his Gospel? As it was made use of by the authors of the first and third Gospels, it must have been written pretty early. And as it was written during Mark's most intimate association with Peter, it was most probably composed before the death of Paul,—during the time of his disagreement with Paul, that is, between the years 45–58 after Christ. It is true, this supposition is not reconcilable with the report of Irenæus in Eusebius,[6] according to which Mark did not write his Gospel until after the death of the Apostles Peter and Paul. But this report rests on an erroneous conclusion drawn from the tradition preserved by Papias; and it does not hold good when, from the fact that Mark prepared his written accounts ὅσα ἐμνημόνευσεν, *Bleek*[7] draws the conclusion that the Presbyter John and Papias could not have expressed themselves thus, had their belief been that Peter was still living and

[1] Acts xv. 37 *et seq.*; Col. iv. 10. [2] Col. iv. 10.
[3] 2 Tim. iv. 11. [4] Acts xx. 12. [5] 1 Pet. v. 13.
[6] Hist. Eccles. V. 10. [7] Einl. in das N. T. p. 116, Anmerk.

that Mark was with him at the time the Gospel was written. From the passage, *Μάρκος μὲν ἑρμηνευτὴς Πέτρου γενόμενος ὅσα ἐμνημόνευσεν ἀκριβῶς ἔγραψεν*,[1] it may with far greater justice be inferred that Mark availed himself of his position as "Hermeneutes" of Peter, to write down the oral statements of Peter, so far as he recollected them from hearing them, not by direction of Peter, perhaps not with any positive understanding with Peter, and it may be, therefore, without asking the Apostle's revision of what he wrote.

The belief that Mark wrote his Gospel during the lifetime of Peter and while Peter was still engaged in teaching, rests principally upon the words: *ὅσα ἐμνημόνευσεν ἀκριβῶς ἔγραψεν οὐ μέντοι τάξει τὰ ὑπὸ τοῦ Χριστοῦ ἢ λεχθέντα ἢ πραχθέντα*.[2] These words are generally understood to mean either that Mark wrote his notes without connection, and especially without regard to chronological order,[3] or that he did not set down the separate evangelical events precisely in the order in which they occurred.[4] But it would be very strange if Papias had without qualification pronounced a Gospel to have been composed without any regard to order, in which it would be impossible to deny a certain chronological order in the connection of the events which it relates. There is, moreover, no rational ground for such an entire lack of order, so little creditable to the author. Least of all is this want of order intelligible, if Mark did not write until after the death of Peter; for in this case there would have been no want of time to revise his materials and reduce them to order.

These difficulties vanish when the passage in Eusebius above referred to is understood as follows: Mark was "Hermeneutes" or interpreter to Peter on his missionary travels. Peter needed such an assistant, because he had not sufficient practice in the Greek and Latin languages to enable him to deliver discourses of any length in those tongues. Mark

[1] Hist. Eccles. III. 41. [2] Hist. Eccles. III. 40.

[3] *Schleiermacher*, Studien und Kritiken, 1832, p. 759.

[4] *Bleek*, Einl. in das N. T. p. 114, &c., and most others.

wrote down the substance of Peter's communications, interpreted by him, so far as he could remember them, immediately afterwards. Nevertheless (μέντοι) he did not write his whole Gospel *at once*. It grew as it were gradually, with certain intervals and divisions, out of the statements of Peter interpreted one after another. This view does not by any means exclude the supposition of a final redaction of the Gospel on the part of Mark. And hence the order of events, manifest in the Gospel as we have it, is probably the work of Mark himself.

This "primitive Mark" (*Urmarcus*), which comes indeed from no Apostle and eyewitness, from no contemporary of the evangelical history, but which is based upon the oral instructions and statements of an Apostle, Peter, containing sketches taken down immediately from his lips, and this all the more exactly as the writer held the office of interpreter to the Apostle and consequently had the materials substantially at his command, is, without doubt, a very important document for a trustworthy historical representation of Jesus. This document does not, however, lie before us in its original form. It has been worked over by a later hand, but without any essential change. Here and there, not always happily, passages have been abridged, and sometimes the original has been amplified.[1] If the hypothesis of *Griesbach* that Mark copied Matthew and Luke[2] is still maintained by careful critics, and contended for with earnestness by *De Wette*, it is because these inquirers are biassed apparently by the more artistic character of the first and third Gospels. We refer the reader to the thorough confutation of this hypothesis by *Holtzmann*.[3] It is worthy of note that the advocates of Griesbach's theory leave out of view that, even according to the tradition of the Church, Mark wrote his Gospel before the two other synoptic Gos-

[1] See the excellent publication of *Holtzmann*, Die synoptischen Evangelien, p. 60 *et seq.*; 110 *et seq.*

[2] As is still held, especially by *Bleek*, Einl. in's. N. T. p. 243.

[3] See his work above referred to, p. 113, &c.

pels appeared, and its earlier origin is attested by its superior simplicity, clearness, and precision of statement. In favor of the priority of Mark's Gospel, however, the following points deserve special consideration: —

a. Of internal marks of any literary aim there are in the second Gospel almost none. It seeks simply to report what took place in the establishment of his Gospel by Jesus Christ. It is accordingly entitled in the simplest manner, ch. I. v. 1, εὐαγγέλιον Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ.[1]

b. This Gospel, as we have it, contains neither any legends of the childhood of Jesus, nor any accounts of his appearances after his resurrection. Hence it follows with wellnigh irresistible certainty that Peter also, in his teachings, touched neither upon the one nor the other. At all events, it is thus evident that the legends respecting the nativity and childhood of Jesus did not get into circulation until a later period, and were first noticed by the later Evangelists. They are not of Apostolic origin. As to the conclusion of the second Gospel (xvi. 8), it is now pretty generally supposed that it did not originally run thus. But it may be with this passage as with Acts xxviii. 31. That Jesus did in some way reveal himself after his crucifixion to his disciples is hinted at in the message of the angel,[2] and Peter distinctly designates Jesus as the Risen. But the more the resurrection was withdrawn from outward and sensible perception, and the more clearly it proved itself to have been simply an inward and spiritual fact, so much the less would it be outwardly represented; and hence we have only to recognize the appropriateness with which Mark concluded his Gospel without mentioning the appearances of Jesus as outward facts. Matthew's account[3] betrays the later legendary coloring, although the remark that some of the disciples were in doubt whether they had seen Jesus[4]

[1] So it reads also in the Codex Sinaiticus.

[2] Mark xvi. 6. [3] Matt. xxviii. 16–20.

[4] Matt. xxviii. 17. [When Matthew states that "some doubted whether it were Jesus whom they saw, may it not be that it was on

appears to point, even in Matthew's Gospel, to a supersensuous appearance of Christ. What Jesus himself[1] is reported to have said is taken from the Collection of his Sayings, of which it probably formed the conclusion. *There can be no weightier testimony to the early composition of Mark's Gospel than the absence in it of the appearances of the Crucified.*

c. The second Gospel gives much less of a miraculous coloring to several of the evangelical events than the first and the third give. We may mention, for instance, the account of the Temptation,[2] the sending forth of the twelve disciples,[3] upon whom, according to the first and third Evangelists, there were conferred great miraculous powers,[4] the prominence given in the second Gospel to external means employed by Jesus in the healing of the sick,[5] the unvarnished account of the so-called Transfiguration,[6] and the plain account of the epileptic in contrast with the obscure representations of the first and third Evangelists.[7]

the occasion which the Apostle Paul refers to when he says (1 Cor. xv. 6) that Jesus was seen "of above five hundred brethren at once"? If it were on that occasion that doubts were entertained by some, their doubts may have arisen from the difficulty of getting near enough to him to assure themselves that it was really he. The account of the resurrection of Jesus in the first Gospel is very curious. Taken by itself, it is of very little value as to any fact that it establishes; but in the light thrown upon it by the other Gospels it is found to be precisely such a story as was likely to be told under the circumstances. Its mistakes are just such mistakes as could not have failed to be made by such a sudden succession of exciting reports as marks that eventful morning. So faithfully does it reflect the impressions of the moment that I cannot but think that it thus bears upon its face evidence of having been written down almost immediately after those startling reports were made. No evidence adduced by Dr. Schenkel for the primitive character of the second Gospel is so strong as the internal evidence showing that Matthew's account of the Resurrection must have been written down almost *at once*. TRANS.]

[1] Matt. xxviii. 18. [2] Mark i. 12. [3] Mark vi. 7.
[4] Matt. x. 8; Luke ix. 1. [5] Mark vii. 33; viii. 23.
[6] Mark ix. 2 to be compared with Matt. xvii. 1 *et seq.*; Luke ix. 28.
[7] Mark ix. 14; Matt. xvii. 14; Luke ix. 37.

d. The second Gospel shows marks of an earlier origin, especially in regard to the discourses of Jesus, its reports of which are briefer and wholly inartificial. To say nothing of the "Sermon on the Mount," wholly wanting in this Gospel, which it must be admitted seems to indicate an omission, there are here — with few exceptions[1] — none of the longer discourses, or rather, such as there are have, in relation to the other two Gospels, an abbreviated character.

e. The second Gospel, finally, contains not a single passage from which it can be inferred that Jesus journeyed several times to Jerusalem and repeatedly took up his abode there. The idea that Jesus, before the final catastrophe, often visited Jerusalem, arose at a later period. It is very probable, however, that those passages in the first and third Evangelists, which have been referred to in proof of such frequent visits to Jerusalem, must be otherwise understood, i. e. as referring to a final longer continuance of Jesus in Judea.

In the first Gospel, the character of a later time is already reflected. That its author made use of the primitive Mark, and indeed that Mark's Gospel is the most substantial component of his narrative, may now be considered as established.[2] But the first Evangelist made use besides of a second document, entitled by Papias *τὰ Λόγια*.[3] Matthew is said to have written this in Hebrew, and every one who used it had to translate it to the best of his ability (*ἡρμήνευσε δὲ αὐτὰ ὡς ἦν δυνατὸς ἕκαστος*). There must therefore have been in the time of Papias various "translations" of the primitive Matthew, which must have been pretty freely treated, as every one translated it according to his ability. Now it certainly would not be altogether inadmissible to apply the term *λόγια* to the narrative material also, as, at least in the passage from Papias adduced by Eusebius, the

[1] Mark iv. 3; ix. 39; xiii. 1.

[2] *Holtzmann*, Die Synopt. Evangelien, p. 169 *et seq.*

[3] *Eusebius*, Hist. Eccles., III. 40.

σύνταξις τῶν κυριακῶν λογίων is to be referred not only to *τὰ ὑπὸ τοῦ Χριστοῦ λεχθέντα*, but to *τὰ πραχθέντα*. But it is more probable that the term *λόγια* in the latter passage was used because, according to the connection, the subject spoken of is the instructions of Peter, and in these the didactic element, i. e. the parables and denunciations of Jesus, were considered the most important, on which account Papias puts *τὰ λεχθέντα* before *πραχθέντα*. On the other hand, it is not easy to see why Papias should have entitled the work of Matthew *λόγια*, if its especial aim was a representation of the life and labors of Jesus. According to the Old Testament use of language,[1] *λόγιον* always stands for a word of divine revelation. The same mode of speech obtains also in the New Testament.[2] The old Greek Fathers used the term in the same way.[3] When *Bleek*[4] refers, in proof of the opposite, to Heb. v. 12, it is to be observed that in this passage the mention of *τῶν λογίων τοῦ θεοῦ* does not by any means refer particularly to the historical facts of the Gospel, but to the divine declarations therein contained, which are to be obeyed, i. e. to the evangelical sayings and precepts. Neither did the Gospel of the Hebrews (*εὐαγγέλιον καθ' Ἑβραίους*), mentioned by *Irenæus*[5] and by *Eusebius*,[6] agree with the "Logia" of Papias, nor did our Greek Matthew spring therefrom. According to the reports of Jerome, who found a copy of this Gospel in the library at Cæsarea in Palestine,[7] it was an apocryphal evangelical composition with an exclusively Jewish Christian coloring, and its contents were for the most part extravagant, unworthy of Christ.[8]

[1] Ps. i. 2; cvii. 11; cxix. 38, 60; Wisdom of Sol. xvi. 11.

[2] Acts vii. 38; 1 Pet. iv. 11; Rom. iii. 2; Heb. v. 12.

[3] Suicer. Thes. Eccles., II., p. 247 *et seq.*

[4] Einl. in's. N. T., p. 94.

[5] Adv. Haer. I. 26, 2; III. 2, 7.

[6] Hist. Eccles. III. 28.

[7] De Viris Illustr., 3; Adv. Pelagianos, 3, 1 in librum 18 Esaiae proem.

[8] *De Wette*, Einl. in's N. T. § 64 und 65; *Kirchhofer*, Quellensammlung, XXXVI., the passages collected.

Eusebius expresses himself in such a way about it that his condemnation of it is beyond all doubt.[1]

As a certain result now of critical investigation into the origin of the Gospels, it is settled that together with the "primitive Mark" (*Urmarcus*) there was yet another composition, — the "primitive Matthew" (*Urmatthäus*), — or Collection of the Sayings and Discourses of Jesus, put together by this Apostle before the year 60, and made public. This Collection was the *Second chief Document* which the author of the first Gospel made use of. Thus the fact that his Gospel was received in the Christian body under the name of the Apostle Matthew is most easily explained. But this Collection was not adopted in the first Gospel without change. The testimony of Papias, that everybody interpreted[2] the *Logia* as well as he could, affords ground for the supposition that the translators allowed themselves to alter, fill out, and amplify the original text. The words ὡς ἦν δυνατός have reference not so much to the linguistic skill of the translators as to their acquaintance with the facts, and these words mean that every translator construed into the desired dialect this primitive Matthew as well as he could, i. e. according to the extent of his information and knowledge of the evangelical traditions, and consequently, improved and arranged and enlarged it as, to the best of his knowledge and conscience, seemed necessary, and so far as he was able to do so from his relation to the whole matter of Christian doctrine. Thus, for example, it is not to be supposed that the so-called Sermon on the Mount (Matt. v. – vii.), was wrought up into a well-ordered whole in the Collection of Sayings, just as it now stands in the Greek Gospel, or that the parables were put together in the same order as in Matt. xiii. The author of the first Gospel made use of later traditions and legends with literary free-

[1] Hist. Eccles. III. 25 : Ἐν τούτοις τινὲς καὶ τὸ καθ' Ἑβραίους εὐαγγέλιον κατέλεξαν, ᾧ μάλιστα Ἑβραίων οἱ τὸν Χριστὸν παραδεξάμενοι χαιρουσι, ταῦτα δὲ πάντα τῶν ἀντιλεγομένων ἂν εἴη.

[2] Euseb. Hist. Eccles. III. 40.

dom and in his own way. He received into his Gospel the story of the childhood of Jesus, and the account of the appearance of Jesus in Galilee after his resurrection. But the legend of the childhood of Jesus in this Gospel is very little wrought up. It does not take in the Baptist. And of the appearances of Jesus after his crucifixion, only one came to the knowledge of the Evangelist.

On the other hand, there meets us at the very beginning of this Gospel a distinct, although not logically sustained design (*Tendenz*), in the attempt to establish the genealogy of Jesus. This attempt is made with primary reference to the Jews, as it begins with Abraham, the progenitor of the Jews. But it belongs to a dogmatic mode of thought different from that of the Evangelist; as, putting out of view its gaps and omissions,[1] it would prove the descent of Jesus from David only upon the supposition that Jesus was actually the son of Joseph. The naïve art with which the Evangelist uses his materials is shown in the fact that, notwithstanding his assumption that the relation to Joseph was wanting through the miraculous conception of Jesus, he still receives into his Gospel the genealogical attempt to prove Jesus, through his paternal genealogical tree, to have been descended from David.

That Jesus was the son of David, the Messiah foretold and promised in the Old Testament,[2] is what he takes pains to show in his Gospel. By a misunderstanding of a prophetical passage, he draws his proof of this point from the supernatural birth of Jesus,[3] from the place of his birth, Bethlehem,[4] from his alleged abode in Egypt,[5] from Herod's cruel treatment of the children of Bethlehem,[6] and from his subsequent dwelling-place, Nazareth (by an application, in contradiction of history, of the Messianic predicate נֵצֶר to the name of the place Nazareth).[7] In all these passages the Evangelist appears not as a reporter aiming only to state

[1] Matt. i. 5, 8, 11.
[2] Matt. i. 1.
[3] Matt. i. 23; compare Is. vii. 14.
[4] Micah, v. 1.
[5] Hosea, xi. 1.
[6] Jerem. xxi. 15.
[7] Is. xi. 1.

facts, as is the case throughout with the authors of the "primitive Mark" and the Collection of Sayings, but shows himself to be under the influence of a dogmatic bias. In narrating the events of the Evangelical history he is always more or less possessed with the idea that, because Jesus was the Messiah, all the Messianic promises of the Old Testament must be fulfilled in his person. And the Christian communities, under the influence of their dogmatic convictions, accepted the contents of the evangelical narrative without ever testing their historical credibility. But to this point of view, thus dogmatically restricted, the subsequent statements of the Evangelist are also accommodated. From the labors of Jesus in the region of Capernaum, the fulfilment of a prophecy in Isaiah is inferred.[1] The Sermon on the Mount has the purpose to show that Jesus was the new Lawgiver, promised by Moses, the prophet raised up by God like Moses,[2] the fulfiller of the Old Testament and the Law.[3] His miracles of healing likewise appear to the Evangelist as the fulfilment of Isaiah's prophecy.[4] His reserve also, shown in forbidding his miracles to be made known, was predicted in Isaiah,[5] and was observed only to conform to the prediction. Even the teaching by parables was adopted by Jesus in order that the obduracy of the Jewish people might be made clearly manifest in their insensibility to so popular a mode of instruction.[6]

This peculiarity of Matthew's Gospel is less apparent from the fourteenth chapter to the twenty-first, on account of the close connection of this portion of it with the primitive Mark.[7] But it becomes all the more conspicuous afterwards. Mark tells the story straight on,[8] how Jesus directed his disciples to bring him a young ass standing ready in a neighboring village. The first Evangelist discovers in this commission a fulfilment of several passages in the prophecies.[9]

[1] Is. viii. 23; ix. 1. [2] Deut. xviii. 15. [3] Matt. v. 17.
[4] Is. liii. 4. [5] Matt. xii. 16–19, and Is. xlii. 1. [6] Is. vi. 10.
[7] *Holtzmann*, in the works already referred to, p. 169 *et seq.*
[8] Mark xi. 1–10. [9] Zech. ix. 9; Is. lxii. 11.

He finds the acclamations of the children in the Temple foretold in the Psalms.[1] At the mention of the abomination of desolation, he appeals to the predictions of the prophet Daniel, while Mark is wholly silent about Daniel.[2] The purchase of the field with the blood-money of Judas, according to the first Gospel, is the fulfilment of a prophecy of Jeremiah, but through a defect of memory, as the passage referred to is in Zechariah,[3] and neither in word nor in sense does it apply to the purchase of a potter's field by the High Priest for thirty pieces of silver.[4] The dogmatic bias (*Tendenz*) of the author of the first Gospel, thus proved, is not however any peculiarly party bias, but springs from a feeling, early and strongly manifested in the Evangelist and his contemporaries, of the necessity of apologizing for Jesus to their countrymen. In contending with Judaism, it was important, especially after the overwhelming catastrophe, — the destruction of Jerusalem, — to adduce proof that the Jewish hope of the theocratic restoration of the kingdom of David was folly, and that in the person of Jesus was fulfilled all that Israel had to look for. The Evangelist was himself profoundly penetrated with the faith that the promises of the Old Testament were fulfilled in Jesus Christ, and he arranged the original materials in his hands conscientiously on the whole, but not without slight changes adapted to his purpose.[5]

That portion of his work which was not contained in the

[1] Ps. viii. 3.

[2] Matt. xxiv. 15; Mark xiii. 14, where the reference to Daniel has been interpolated from Matthew, at a later time, in some of the old MSS.

[3] Zech. xi. 12.

[4] Matt. xxvii. 9.

[5] Thus, e. g. ch. i. 16, where he probably left out the words, Ἰακὼβ δὲ ἐγέννησε τὸν Ἰησοῦν τὸν λεγόμενον Χριστόν, and put in their place, τὸν ἄνδρα Μαρίας, ἐξ ἧς ἐγεννήθη Ἰησοῦς ὁ λεγόμενος Χριστός. The attribute λεγόμενος, which is in accordance neither with his dogmatic idea of Jesus nor with his apologetic bias, he left standing through his naïvely uncritical way of using his materials.

primitive Mark or in the Collection of Sayings[1] was very probably derived by Matthew from oral tradition. Even in this respect he has followed his main bias, — the apologetic reference to the unbelieving Jews. The baptism of Jesus by John the Baptist was likely in time to become offensive to popular ideas: Matthew takes care to introduce John's refusal to baptize Jesus in the first instance.[2] Jesus still passed among the unbelieving Jews for a destroyer of the Old Testament Law: Matthew strengthens and amplifies the declaration of the Lord — extant also in Luke[3] — in favor of the indissoluble obligation of the Mosaic Law, following perhaps some peculiar traditions of which he had no authentic proof.[4] He was not also without a polemic interest.[5] A peculiarly beautiful word of consolation, uttered by the Lord, appears to have found acceptance with Matthew, with special reference to the then existing circumstances under which the Jewish people groaned.[6] It suited the purpose of the Evangelist to show that even under the Old Covenant the priests might break the Sabbath without blame.[7] A peculiar concession to the institutions of the Jews is contained in the declaration ascribed to Jesus, that the disciples were to do and observe whatever the Scribes and Pharisees commanded them to do and observe; thus, the difference between Jesus and the Scribes and Pharisees was made apparent only in the direction of practical morality.[8] It is upon this ground of practical morality that Jesus appears to stand, according to the first Evangelist, in his announcement of the final judgment.[9]

The obviously greater prominence given by Matthew, compared with Mark, to the miraculous element in the evangelical narrative is worthy of note, in reference to the historical character of the first Gospel. Thus, Matthew

[1] *Holtzmann*, ib. p. 188. [2] Matt. iii. 14. [3] Luke xvi. 17.
[4] Matt. v. 17 – 20. [5] Matt. vii. 6, 15, 26.
[6] Matt. xi. 28 – 30. [7] Matt. xii. 5.
[8] Matt. xxiii. 3. A similar concession to Judaism is made v. 17 – 20.
[9] Matt. xxv. 31.

represents not only Jesus, but Peter also, as walking on the water.[1] He tells us of the tax-money that Peter finds so incomprehensibly in the mouth of a fish.[2] Even the state of celibacy he appears to consider in some circumstances as a miraculous gift.[3] The purchase of the potter's field with the thirty pieces of silver,[4] appears to him a miraculous fulfilment of prophecy. He reports a miraculous dream of the wife of Pilate.[5] The account of Pilate washing his hands upon the occasion of the trial of Jesus, one might almost regard as a miraculous purification of the unbelieving Roman. The miracle of the resurrection of the dead in consequence of the earthquake at the death of Jesus,[6] is found only in Matthew. The report of the incidents, almost more than miraculous, in relation to the guard at the tomb of Jesus, is peculiar to this Evangelist,[7] as is also the very improbable story of the bribery of the guard.[8]

In the case of the first Evangelist, therefore, we certainly stand no longer upon ground purely historical. With the exception of the primitive Mark and the Collection of Sayings, there are no other original records accredited by eye or ear-witnesses, upon which the representation of this Evangelist rests. And how very much he is occasionally wanting in critical exactness, we have seen in the case, already mentioned, of the genealogy which he adopts. All the more does a critical representation of the idea of Jesus stand in opposition to that of this Evangelist.

The first Gospel was written *after* the destruction of Jerusalem, as is to be inferred from the allusion to the Roman eagles, to which *Meyer*,[9] without any reason, allows no weight. When the Evangelist composed his Gospel, the first part of the Coming of Christ was already fulfilled in the βδέλυγμα τῆς ἐρημώσεως, the devastation of the Sanctuary by the profane hands of the heathen.[10] The time for the

[1] Matt. xiv. 28. [2] Matt. xvii. 27. [3] Matt. xix. 11.
[4] Matt. xxvii. 3. [5] Matt. xxvii. 19. [6] Matt. xxvii. 51.
[7] Matt. xxvii. 62; xxviii. 11. [8] Matt. xxviii. 12.
[9] Ex. Handbuch zu Matt. xxiv. 28. [10] Matt. xxiv. 15.

announcement of the Gospel among all nations had now arrived.[1] The Evangelist therefore confidently expected the near end of the then period of the world. This he has plainly intimated by changing the passage in the primitive Mark relating thereto. In the latter, the time of the Advent, which was expected after the destruction of Jerusalem, is intimated in the words, *ἐν ἐκείναις ταῖς ἡμέραις μετὰ τὴν θλῖψιν ἐκείνην*,[2] i. e. the beginning and the end of the *θλῖψις* are represented as yet to happen. The first Evangelist, on the other hand, shows, by his announcing the Advent in the words, *εὐθέως δὲ μετὰ τὴν θλῖψιν τῶν ἡμερῶν ἐκείνων*, that, at the time of that writing, he was full of the expectation of the final Judgment, an expectation, which could have been raised to such a pitch only by the Judgment's having taken place immediately before at Jerusalem. The Evangelist evidently intimates that the coming of the Lord would occur earlier than the Christians of his time expected.[3] Hence we are enabled to understand those eschatological parables peculiar to Matthew, and strikingly expressive of the state of mind among the Jewish Christians then living in Palestine. Of this class are: The parable of the laborers in the vineyard,[4] which seeks to contradict the idea that those who were received into the kingdom of God at the last, did not deserve the same reward at the Advent which those were to receive who had been longer converted; the parable of the two sons,[5] which, in view of the coming great catastrophe, promises precedence of the high priests and elders to the "publicans and harlots"; the parable of the marriage feast,[6] which likewise assumes[7] that the time for the announcement of the Gospel over the whole earth had come, and the reader is, in a manner, transported to the scene of the last Judgment;[8] the parable of the wise and foolish virgins,[9] addressed to those who, even after the destruction of Jerusalem had taken place, still would not believe in the immediate

[1] Matt. xxviii. 19. [2] Mark xiii. 24. [3] Matt. xxiv. 44.
[4] Matt. xx. 1–16. [5] Matt. xxi. 28–32. [6] Matt. xxii. 1–14.
[7] Matt. xxiv. 14. [8] Matt. xxii. 12. [9] Matt. xxv. 1–13.

proximity of the Advent. It is only from this point of view that full light is shed upon the conclusion of the Gospel, which, in consideration of the point of time at which the Gospel was written, gives us most appropriately the declaration of Jesus that he would be with his disciples (in so great tribulation) to the completion of the last period which had just then begun.[1] We see also how the first Evangelist represents Jesus as speaking of those who had made themselves eunuchs for the kingdom of heaven's sake, i. e. for the sake of the Advent then at hand.[2] From this point of view also, light is thrown upon those much misunderstood words of Jesus, found only in Matthew, that he would give to Peter the keys of the kingdom of heaven, and that what Peter bound on earth should be bound in heaven.[3] It was those keys that were meant which, at the coming of the Lord, were to open the gates into his glorified Communion.*

From these views, it follows indubitably that the first

[1] Matt. xxviii. 20. [2] Matt. xix. 11. [3] Matt. xvi. 19.

* [What are we to understand by the remarks which the author makes above upon the so-called eschatological parables? Does he intend to give us the impression that they were the fictions of a period subsequent to the time of Jesus? The coloring or turn given to them above is, to say the least, questionable. The first in the enumeration, the parable of the laborers in the vineyard, (Matt. xx. 1 – 16,) grew out of a particular occasion, and was evidently designed to correct the false expectation cherished and just before disclosed by the question of Peter, "What shall we have therefore, we who have left all and followed thee?" (Matt. xiv. 27.) The disciples were expecting to gain an advantage by their early attachment to the person of Jesus. And all, evidently, that the parable meant was that no difference would be made among those who should come to the knowledge and service of the truth at different periods in the providence of God. The parable of the two sons contains no promise or prediction. It is the statement of a fact, namely, that publicans and harlots had precedence of the Priests and Pharisees in the interest which they manifested in the truths taught by Jesus. That the author of the first Gospel was under a Jewish bias, and delighted to find the old prophecies fulfilled in the history of Jesus, Dr. Schenkel shows very satisfactorily. But that the Evangelist relates certain parables with the purpose ascribed to him above does not so plainly appear. — Trans.]

Gospel stands in no slight degree below the second in originality and authenticity, and, as an historical document, is to be used with caution in those passages in which it varies from the primitive Mark and the Collection of Sayings. But inasmuch as it is the one Gospel of the first three that gives us again most fully and faithfully a second genuinely apostolical source of information, namely, the Collection of Sayings, the first Gospel is of very considerable historical value. In its legends of the childhood of Jesus, and in its eschatological expectations, it places the dogmatic standpoint of the Palestinian Christians after the year 70 in a very instructive light for us.

The third Gospel is unquestionably the latest of the first three. In this Gospel, as in the first, the primitive Mark and the Collection of Sayings are made use of, but not our Greek Matthew, whence the fact that the first Gospel precedes Luke in a number of sections peculiar to the first Gospel, is explained. The author of the first Gospel is unknown to us; so also is the editor of the second. In conformity with the old Church tradition,[1] Luke is to be received as the author of the third, — the same Luke mentioned by Paul, as physician and friend beloved.[2] He was also, in his dogmatic views, a pupil of Paul, by birth a Gentile, and Paul distinguished him emphatically from his Jewish Christian partners in suffering, with whom he had small cause to be content.[3] In the preface of his Gospel, Luke speaks of himself neither as a disciple of Jesus nor as an eyewitness (αὐτόπτης), nor yet as ὑπηρέτης τοῦ λόγου, i. e. as an apostolic announcer of the Gospel, but as a compiler of such evangelical reports as others had written down before him.[4] From this passage, it follows that the literary materials used by him were based originally on oral tradition, and that he sought to arrange carefully the evangelical accounts extant in his time. That, in mentioning the πολλοί whose labors he consulted, he must have been thinking of

[1] Iren. Adv. Haer. III. 14, 1; Euseb. Hist. Eccles. III. 4.
[2] Col. iv. 14. [3] Col. iv. 11. [4] Luke i. 1–4.

the Gospel of Matthew,[1] is a groundless supposition. On the contrary, it is scarcely to be supposed that he would have thought it necessary to undertake the evangelical history in the form chosen by him, had he found beforehand so extended a work as the first Gospel. *Holtzmann* (with whom *Ritschl*, *Reuss*, *Ewald*, *Plitt* and *Weiss* agree) well remarks, that one who was already acquainted with a genealogical register according to which Jesus belonged to the royal line of David, would hardly have supposed that he could do better by having recourse to a collateral line of the house of David. And we entirely agree with *Holtzmann*, who, in the conclusion of his able inquiry decides, in regard to the question whether Matthew were dependent upon Luke, or Luke upon Matthew, that neither the one nor the other was even possible, to say nothing of probabilities.[2]

The third Gospel bears unmistakable signs of a mode of representation distinguished by an evident bias. It forms the Gentile Christian antithesis to the Jewish Christian thesis in the evangelical history, and it aims to give to Christianity a universal significance. According to the preface, it is a composition intended to confirm the faith of a distinguished Gentile catechumen in evangelical truth.[3] Its late origin is shown, not only by the testimony of the author himself, who represents himself as only a secondary worker in the field, but also by the whole treatment of the materials. The legend of the Childhood is related more at length, and with more marvellous details, than in the first Gospel; the early history of the Baptist is interwoven with it; the legend of the supernatural conception of Jesus, in comparison with the brief account in Matthew,[4] is much amplified.[5] The Baptist, while yet in his mother's womb, bears witness to the Messianic dignity of the yet unborn Jesus; and the future mother of the Baptist, upon meeting the future mother of Jesus, becomes a prophetess.[6] The

[1] *Meyer*, Ex. Handbuch zu Luc., i. 1–4.
[2] *Holtzmann*, ib. 264.
[3] Luke i. 4.
[4] Matt. i. 18.
[5] Luke i. 26–38.
[6] Luke i. 41.

father of the Baptist also, immediately upon the birth of his son, recognizes in him the appointed forerunner of the Messiah.[1] The account in Luke of the birth of Jesus in Bethlehem[2] is of a no less legendary character. Not only are shepherds in the fields made fully acquainted with the secret of the Messianic office of Jesus by an apparition of angels, not only does the mother of Jesus lay the secret to heart, not only are others filled with wonder thereat, but an aged man declares, when Mary makes the customary offering of purification for her new-born child, that he should now depart in peace, since he had seen the salvation of Israel, — seen him who was set for the rising or falling of many in Israel; and an aged woman likewise gives thanks that the redemption of Israel had now appeared.[3]

In all these stories, of which nothing whatever is to be found in the primitive Gospel or in the Collection of Sayings, there is reflected the apologetic demand and endeavor of a later period, which the simple evangelical facts, carrying in themselves the evidence of the spirit and of power, were no longer sufficient to satisfy, and in which period the direct impress of the individual personality of Jesus was fading dimly away into the background, and the exciting influence of marvellous and unheard-of exaggerations was needed, in order to give attraction and force to the idea entertained of the Redeemer. On the other hand, these marvellous narrations are evidences of the extraordinary effect produced by Jesus, not only upon the men of his own day but also upon generations following.

Thus it happens that the coloring of the miraculous is much stronger in the third Gospel than in the first. The calling of the first four disciples, for example, is told in Mark[4] and in Matthew[5] in agreement with the primitive Mark, without any marvellous additions. Luke, on the contrary, following a later legend, embellishes the event with the miracle of a superabundant draught of fishes, and

[1] Luke i. 17, 76. [2] Luke ii. 1. [3] Luke ii. 8–38.
[4] Mark i. 16. [5] Matt. iv. 18.

the historical fact, — the calling of the disciples, — recedes entirely into the shade before the miracle.[1] In a similar way the raising of the young man of Nain,[2] a narrative peculiar to Luke's Gospel, appears to be the exaggeration of a later legend. Thus also the later origin of this Gospel is attested by the detailed accounts of the appearances of Jesus after his crucifixion in Jerusalem, of which appearances the older tradition in Mark and Matthew apparently knows nothing. While Paul represents such appearances, of which he had information before the year 60 after Christ,[3] as of the same description precisely with the vision of Christ that was accorded to himself, in the third Gospel, on the other hand, the risen Saviour holds intercourse with his disciples as an actual man and has "flesh and bones," which he offers to his disciples for examination.[4] These accounts of the risen Saviour contradict, moreover, the reports of Mark and Matthew. While Mark tells us that the disciples were directed to go to Galilee, and while Matthew states that Jesus actually took leave of his disciples there, according to Luke the appearances of Jesus are confined to Jerusalem. On the very day of his resurrection he is carried up to heaven,[5] and he expressly forbids his disciples to leave Jerusalem before the outpouring of the Holy Spirit.[6] How the legend was always growing is plainly seen in the relation of Luke's Gospel to the Book of Acts, written by him afterwards, according to which, in consequence of a later tradition, the intercourse of Jesus with his disciples after his resurrection is extended from one day to forty days.[7]

Furthermore, in the sections peculiar to the third Gospel there is visible a Gentile-Christian bias in favor of the universality of Christianity. This appears, for instance, in the genealogy of Christ,[8] which goes back, not as in Matthew, to the progenitor of the Jewish people, but to the progenitor of the human race, Adam.[9] Consequently the aim is, in the

[1] Luke v. 1.
[2] Luke vii. 11.
[3] 1 Cor. xv. 5.
[4] Luke xxiv. 39.
[5] Luke xxiv. 50.
[6] Luke xxiv. 49.
[7] Acts i. 3.
[8] Luke iii. 23.
[9] Luke iii. 38.

genuine style of Paul, to prove Christ to be the Second Adam,[1] and by virtue of his supernatural generation as such, the immediate Son of God.[2] The genealogy of Luke, however, although varying essentially from that of Matthew, and following the collateral line of Nathan in the genealogical register of David,[3] proves that, at the time Luke wrote, Jesus passed for the actual son of Joseph, a belief which Luke sought to correct by adding to the words, ὢν υἱὸς τοῦ Ἰωσήφ, the words, ὡς ἐνομίζετο.[4] Beyond all question, this Evangelist manifests a predilection for such features in the portrait of the life of Jesus as show that the labors of Jesus extended beyond the narrow sphere of the Palestinian Jews. Thus, for example, in Luke the Samaritans receive especially favorable treatment in comparison with the Jews,[5] while, according to Matthew,[6] Jesus forbids his disciples to go to the Gentiles or to enter a Samaritan city. The account in Luke of the sending forth of the seventy likewise indicates a bias in favor of the universal character of the Gospel.[7] That many passages in the third Gospel manifest an interest, peculiar to Paul's style of teaching, in the free grace and mercy of God, has recently been remarked by *Holtzmann*.[8] As instances in point we refer to the notices of the woman who was a sinner,[9] of Mary and Martha,[10] of the little flock,[11] of the Galileans who were destroyed,[12] to the parables of the lost piece of money and the prodigal son,[13] to what is said about unprofitable servants,[14] to the comparison made between Pharisees and Publicans,[15] to the account of Zaccheus,[16] to the treatment of the malefactors by Jesus on the cross,[17] &c.

But, on the other hand, it is not just to regard the third Gospel as a composition of a purely dogmatic character,

[1] Rom. v. 12.
[2] Luke iii. 38; τοῦ Ἀδάμ, τοῦ θεοῦ.
[3] 2 Sam. v. 14.
[4] Luke iii. 23.
[5] Luke x. 25; xvii. 11.
[6] Matt. x. 5.
[7] Luke x. 1.
[8] *Holtzmann*, ib. p. 391 *et seq.*
[9] Luke vii. 36.
[10] Luke x. 38.
[11] Luke xii. 32.
[12] Luke xiii. 1.
[13] Luke xv. 1.
[14] Luke xvii. 10.
[15] Luke xviii. 9.
[16] Luke xix. 1.
[17] Luke xxiii. 39.

and on this account to deny it all claims to credibility. Even when Luke's narrative is the less authentic, and he permits himself to be biassed by the later legend, he does not, for the sake of any dogmatic point, invent the particulars, but he has recourse always to the traditions which were accessible to him, as *Ewald*, for example, has satisfactorily shown in regard to the seventy disciples.[1] Such is the case with the great episode, — the so-called Journey Report (*Reiseberichte*).[2] For this section of his Gospel, Luke made use of original documents of a character altogether peculiar, — documents which did not relate, as is commonly supposed, only to the few days spent by Jesus on his journey from Galilee to Judea. Luke, following, moreover, no distinct chronological thread, generally taking *verbatim* the accounts that were in his hands without particular examination, lacking, besides, the sure eye of a personal witness of the events which he relates, has, from the beginning, confused the representation of the episode in regard to a main point, to which error, the source whence he drew his relations, the original Gospel, doubtless, contributed in part. The first three Gospels mention only *one* sojourn of Jesus in Judea towards the last, and, according to their representation, it was of a very short duration. But this account is apparently contradicted by a declaration of Jesus, in which he says that he had *often* (ποσάκις) desired to gather the children of Jerusalem as a hen gathers her brood under her wings.[3] From this passage the conclusion is commonly drawn that Jesus, even according to the synoptic representation, paid several visits, more or less prolonged, to Jerusalem, and made repeated attempts to convert the people of the capital. Now what *Bleek* unjustly styles sheer desperation,[4] is by no means impossible, that, as *Baur*[5] and

1 *Ewald*, Die Drei Ersten Evangelien, p. 284.
2 From Luke ix. 1 to Luke xviii. 30.
3 Matt. xxiii. 37; Luke xiii. 34.
4 Synoptische Erklärung, II. p. 179.
5 Krit. Untersuchungen, p. 127; *Zeller's* Jahrbücher, 1847, p. 99.

Hilgenfeld[1] suppose, Jesus recognized in the capital the central point of the Jewish nation, and by the "children of Jerusalem" the mass of the Jewish people are to be understood. But *Baur*[2] concedes that it is more natural to understand by the children of the capital those who dwelt in it. Hence he admits the supposition that the words, put into the mouth of Jesus, may be taken as the words of a prophet speaking in the name of God; and *D. F. Strauss*[3] has recently made an ingenious attempt to prove that the lamentation in Matt. xxiii. and Luke xiii. was taken from a lost writing mentioned in another passage in Luke[4] as σοφία τοῦ θεοῦ. But to say nothing of the improbability, after what he states in his introduction, of Luke's making use of an apocryphal work in reporting the utterances of Jesus, and of the still greater improbability of Matthew and Luke's agreeing in so abnormal a proceeding, it being much more probable that their agreement is owing to a common use of the Collection of Sayings, that remarkable lamentation of Jesus may be historically established in a much more satisfactory way. As it is impossible that Jesus could have said and done, in the few days which it took him to journey from Galilee to the place of the feast, all that Luke relates in the so-called *Reiseberichte*, extending from ch. ix. 51 to ch. xviii. 30, the supposition is all the more natural that a considerable portion of this part of Luke's Gospel falls within the time of the last abode of Jesus in Judea and Jerusalem.

This section of Luke's Gospel is not by any means wanting in expressive signs and marks that go to strengthen the probability of this supposition. The incident concerning Martha and Mary[5] carries us undoubtedly to Bethany, thus to the immediate vicinity of Jerusalem. The discourses against the Pharisees[6] were, as Matthew testifies,[7] delivered

[1] Die Evangelien, p. 101. [2] *Baur*, ib. p. 127, Anm.

[3] *Hilgenfeld*, Zeitschrift fur wissenschaftliche Theologie, 1863, p. 84; Das Leben Jesu für das deutsche Volk, p. 249.

[4] Luke xi. 49. [5] Luke x. 38. [6] Luke xi. 37. [7] Matt. xxiii. 1.

in Jerusalem. The allusion to the violent proceedings of Pilate[1] was most probably made when Jesus was in the capital at the last. The scene with the Pharisees,[2] even according to the connection in Luke,[3] could have taken place only in Jerusalem. The reference to Herod Antipas[4] connects itself with the journeyings of Jesus in Judea before his last entry into Jerusalem.[5] It is only in this connection of thought that the citation of the lament over the city is founded.[6] The parable of the Supper also was uttered in Jerusalem or its neighborhood.[7] Those most pregnant parables[8] unquestionably appear to belong to the same important juncture in the career of Jesus with the eschatological discourses; and the parable of the Pharisee and the Publican evidently presupposes the presence of the Temple.[9] Accordingly it is a fact beyond dispute, that, before the Feast of the Passover at which the decisive blow was struck by his enemies, Jesus spent some time in Judea, visiting the capital several times, proclaiming the doctrine of the divine kingdom,[10] coming into violent collision with the Scribes and Pharisees,[11] and thus at last rendering the breach with the hierarchical party irreparable.[12] The lament over Jerusalem thus loses its extraordinary character, even upon the supposition that Jesus sojourned in Judea only once and at the last. On the other hand, it is wholly inexplicable, if Jesus went repeatedly from Galilee to the Jewish festivals at Jerusalem, that the three synoptic Gospels, *having their origin in the soil of Palestine*, should have had no knowledge of it. And besides, the public entry of Jesus into Jerusalem in view of the Temple, under the eyes of the High Jewish Council, in the very heart of the theocracy and seat of the reigning theological schools, was much worthier of notice than his far more quiet labors

[1] Luke xiii. 1. [2] Luke xiii. 31. [3] Luke xiii. 33.
[4] Luke xiii. 32. [5] Luke xix. 29. [6] Luke xiii. 34.
[7] Luke xiv. 7 *et seq.*, judging from Matt. xxii. 1.
[8] Luke xv. and xvi. [9] Luke xviii. 9. [10] Luke xvii. 20.
[11] Matt. xxiii. 1. [12] Matt. xxiii. 37; Luke xiii. 34.

in a remote region on the shores of the lake of Tiberias. Luke made use, not only of all the older accounts circulating in his time, but also of a number of later Jewish reports, and was it possible that not a single one of them should make the remotest allusion to the repeated visits of Jesus to Jerusalem, or to his conflicts there with the leaders of the theocratic party and his participation in the festal solemnities of the people? We can easily understand how the prolonged abode of Jesus in Judea immediately preceding the final catastrophe in Jerusalem should fade away from the memory of the primitive Christian body before the great events of those last few days. We can see also how it was that Luke was led to confound and mix up the various reports that he had in hand of that last sojourn in Judea with the brief journey of Jesus through Samaria, and thus perplex the readers of his Gospel, learned and unlearned, up to the present day. There is an expression, moreover, preserved in the second Gospel that satisfies us entirely that, before his last entry into Jerusalem Jesus had *never* attended a festival there. According to the second Gospel, Jesus, upon his arrival in the city, immediately betook himself to the Temple, *περιβλεψάμενος πάντα*; so that until then he had never seen the edifice near at hand, which is inconsistent with the idea that he had attended the national festivals several times, and especially with the representation of the fourth Gospel, which tells us of his having driven the traders from the Temple at the very beginning of his career.

The third Gospel is then the last written. Jerusalem was in ruins when the third Evangelist wrote his Gospel. The beleaguering host of Rome was still before his mind,[1] but yet some time must have passed since the horrors of the siege were enacted, for in his time Jerusalem was already trodden by the feet of the Gentiles. They had already established themselves in the city. The carrying off of captives into the Roman provinces was already an accom-

[1] Luke xxi. 20.

plished fact.[1] For this reason Luke goes upon the idea that between the destruction of Jerusalem and the coming of Christ there lay a considerable space of time, — the so-called καιροὶ ἐθνῶν, — an interval in which the Gentiles were to bear unlimited sway, until the last judgment should come. It was in this time, according to his own statement, that the third Evangelist lived and composed his Gospel. He did not therefore any longer expect the "immediate" coming of Christ,[2] as the author of Matthew did, who wrote his Gospel directly after the destruction of the Sanctuary. The Coming, in Luke's Gospel, is removed to an indefinite distance. On the whole, to the third Gospel there cannot well be assigned an earlier date than the year 80.[3] The legendary element is increased in this Gospel. But the Gospel is substantially an authentic evangelical writing, although drawn in part from secondary sources.

[While I cordially acknowledge the obligations which we are under to Dr. Schenkel for the learning and fidelity with which the subject of the foregoing "Illustration" is treated, it cannot be forgotten that, amidst the multitude of contingencies by which the early history of the Gospels may have been affected, it is possible that they had an origin which, if known, would materially modify his conclusions. While he attaches the highest value to the second Gospel, he concedes that we have not now the original work of Mark, — that for the Gospel as it now is we are indebted to another hand than that of the "spiritual son" of the Apostle Peter. And our author is compelled to suppose the early existence of a work no longer extant, — the so-called Collection of Sayings (*Spruchsammlung*), identical probably with the *Logia* mentioned by Papias, and traces of which our author discovers throughout the first Gospel. It may be taken, therefore, as the conclusion of the learned, that our present Gospels, in the shape in which they now exist, are not the original records, but are constructed out of

[1] Luke xxi. 24. [2] Luke xxi. 25. [3] Luke xxi. 32.

previously existing materials. It is interesting to remark how entirely, in the absence of all external and collateral testimony, this conclusion has been arrived at purely by the consideration of the internal character of the Gospels. — TRANS.]

2. p. 31. In addition to what we have said in regard to the origin and historical credibility of the Fourth Gospel, we offer here some further observations. The objection that, if John be denied the authorship of this Gospel, its historical credibility must also be given up, has been met, we conceive, in what we have already said. The evangelical history is sufficiently authenticated by the Synoptics, even if the Fourth Gospel be rejected as an historical work. On the other hand, if this Gospel be considered an apostolic writing of unqualified historical value, then the synoptical tradition, in the most essential points, becomes untrustworthy and useless. What the Fourth Gospel gains in respect of historical credibility, the Synoptics lose.

The differences between the first three Gospels and the Fourth Gospel are not of a merely secondary character. In regard to these differences, it is a very poor consolation that *Bleek* finds in the difference between Plato and Xenophon in their representations of the person and teachings of Socrates.[1] In the case of the Synoptics and the Fourth Gospel we have not merely different modes of conceiving and estimating the personal character of Jesus, but representations of him directly opposite to each other. The first three Gospels place before us an idea of Jesus, which is developed before our eyes. According to these accounts Jesus had to pass through a series of temptations. He had to contend with inward difficulties, and even in the last critical hours of his life he was not entirely clear in his own mind whether or not it were the will of his Father that he should crown his work with suffering and death. The first three Gospels lay the scene of the history of Jesus,

[1] Einl. in das N. T., p. 195.

except at the close, in Galilee. They know of only one sojourn of Jesus in Judea. They describe the relation of Jesus to the Old Testament as originally not at all a hostile relation or even as a differing relation. It is not the "Jews" as such, but only the Scribes and Pharisees, who are described by them as the enemies and persecutors of Jesus. In the Synoptics Jesus speaks, never as a speculative, cultivated thinker, in sentences dark, abrupt, scarcely intelligible, and moulded in accordance with a certain systematic style of doctrine, but always as a true man of the people, in pithy, concise sayings, deep and yet luminous, and especially in similitudes. He designates himself emphatically as the "Son of Man." A long time elapses before he proclaims himself, or rather allows himself to be proclaimed, in the circle of the Twelve as the Messiah. And it is yet longer before his disciples rightly appreciate his Messianic destiny; and they obtain no clear insight into his aims and into the nature of the divine kingdom established by him until after his death.

The Fourth Gospel, on the contrary, goes, as has already been remarked, upon an essentially different view of the facts. It presents us with a representation of Jesus in which there is no development. According to this account, Jesus had no temptations to withstand, no inward difficulties to overcome; and as to what was the will of his Father, he was perfectly clear in himself from first to last. He had foreknowledge of his sufferings and death from the very outset of his public life; he knew at that time that his body and blood would be the life of the world. Before he had become to any extent known in Galilee, he betook himself to the very central seat of the theocracy, to Jerusalem, and there, in cleansing the Temple of the traders, ventured upon a deed so bold that one is at a loss to understand how he could undertake such an act at the very beginning of his public work, and how he could do it unpunished under the very eyes of the magistracy and guardians of the Temple. All that was done by the Jews, according to the Fourth Gos-

pel, was to put the question to him how he could justify himself for so bold a proceeding; this was all the opposition which he encountered. He travels repeatedly from Galilee to the festivals in Jerusalem and back. Of his labors in Galilee, however, very little is said in the Fourth Gospel. He shows himself entirely alienated from the Old Testament. He looks upon the "Jews" as, without qualification, foes and persecutors, and even as children of the Devil. His utterances are thoughtful, but dark and even enigmatical, not at all of a popular character. They must have been unintelligible to the multitude, to whom, according to the first three Gospels, he addressed himself almost exclusively. He reveals his glory at once,[1] names himself Son of God,[2] is instantly acknowledged as the suffering Redeemer by the Baptist, and by his disciples as the Messiah, and gives himself to be recognized at once as such by the Samaritans.[3]

These general features present differences which point to an essentially different background of facts in the Fourth Gospel from that of the first three Gospels, and if any certain and well-founded conclusion is to be arrived at, it is this: if the synoptic representation of the evangelical history be the correct one, then that of the Fourth Gospel is not correct, and the reverse. Where a difference so sharply marked exists, to talk of "worn-out arguments," and to stigmatize those who have been led, through a conscientious examination of facts and after weighing all the circumstances of the case, to the conclusion that the first three Gospels are more worthy of credit than the Fourth, as men "who are seeking to wrest his Gospel from the Apostle, and its original evangelical jewel from the Church,"[4] is to use the language, not of liberal criticism and grave scientific inquiry, but of a bigoted sophistry that dishonors the principles and spirit of Protestantism.

[1] John ii. 11. [2] John iii. 16. [3] John iv. 26, 42.

[4] *Meyer*, Vorrede zur 4. Aufl. seines ex. Handbuches über das Evangel. Joh.

The external evidences as to the origin of the Fourth Gospel are not decisive. They are not decidedly unfavorable to the authorship of John, but neither are they so favorable to it that it can rest with certainty upon them alone. That this Gospel was first known among those who were inclined to Gnosticism, in the first half of the second century, i. e. after the year 120, may be accepted with tolerable confidence. *Hippolytus* quotes from Basilides John i. 9, and John ii. 4;[1] but whether these quotations are really from Basilides, and not from his pupils,[2] cannot indeed be decided. But however this may be, that John wrote this Gospel cannot by any means be proved by these quotations.[3] From the fact that the Alexandrian Gnostics were acquainted with this Gospel about the years 120 – 130, we are justified only in concluding that it was written at least some years earlier (110 – 120). The reason why it so soon found more general acceptance among them is to be found in its speculative character, akin to Gnosticism. It is very remarkable, on the other hand, that *Papias*, although so near (in Hierapolis) to the origin of the Gospel, makes no mention of it,[4] while he makes use of passages from 1 John and 1 Peter.[5] Still more remarkable is it, that although in the epistle of *Polycarp* to the Philippians the Synoptics are often used,[6] the Fourth Gospel, which, as a work of the Apostle John's, must have had a special value in the eyes of Polycarp, is never mentioned. Whether *Justin Martyr* knew of the Fourth Gospel cannot be concluded with any certainty from quotations such as *καὶ γὰρ ὁ Χριστὸς εἶπεν: ἂν μὴ ἀναγεννηθῆτε, οὐ μὴ εἰσέλθητε εἰς τὴν βασιλείαν τῶν οὐρανῶν, κ. τ. λ.*[7]

[1] Philosophumena, VII. 22, 27.

[2] Comp. *Zeller*, Theol. Jahrbücher, 1853, p. 144 *et seq.* *Baur*, ib. 1854, p. 269, &c.

[3] Comp. *Hilgenfeld*, Die Evangelien, p. 345, Anm. 5.

[4] Euseb. Hist. Eccles. III. 40.

[5] See *Zeller*, Theol. Jahrb., 1847, p. 148 *et seq.*

[6] *Dressel*, Patr. Ap. Op., p. 378 (see ch. 2, 6, 7).

[7] See Matt. xviii. 3; Hom. Clem. II. 26; Just. Mart. Apol. I. 61.

Still less can it be concluded from 2 Peter i. 14 that reference is there made to John xxi. 18.

Not until the end of the second century was the Fourth Gospel received, with the other three Gospels, as a work of the Apostle John's. *Irenæus* is the first competent witness of this fact (Theophilus of Antioch cannot be so regarded). It must, however, excite some astonishment that such distinguished inquirers as *Lücke*[1] and *Bleek*[2] should allow so much weight to this testimony. It is evident how little critical care *Irenæus* used in his statements in regard to the literature of the Gospel, and how very much he was swayed, in opposition to the Gnostics, by apologetic and polemical considerations. He has not the slightest doubt that the Apostle Matthew wrote the first Gospel in Hebrew at the time that Peter and Paul labored together in Rome.[3] And yet there is now no result of biblical criticism more certain than that the first Gospel was *not* written by the Apostle Matthew, and that Peter never labored in Rome with Paul. So likewise the report of *Irenæus* that Mark did not write his Gospel until after the death of both those Apostles, has in itself no probability. Neither is his statement any more worthy of credit that Luke put into writing the Gospel preached by Paul, the introduction to Luke's Gospel contradicting this assertion directly. Hence what *Irenæus* says in regard to the Apostle John's being the author of the Fourth Gospel is deserving of no more weight than what he tells us of the authors and origin of the other Gospels. He has stated explicitly the particular reason why the addition of a fourth canonical Gospel to the first three Gospels seemed to him indispensable. It was, he considers, a high (dogmatic) necessity. With incredible *naïveté*[4] he says that there could not be *either more or less* than four Gospels, and for the reason that there must be just as many Gospels as there are quarters of the world, as there are principal

[1] Commentar über das Ev. d. Joh. I. p. 73.
[2] Einl. in das N. T., p. 22.
[3] Adv. Haer. III. 1.
[4] Adv. Haer. III. 8.

winds, and as there are Cherubim. He also seeks to prove from a passage in the Psalms[1] that He who dwells between the Cherubim must have four Gospels, or rather a τετράμορφον εὐαγγέλιον, corresponding to the four faces of the Cherubim. The Gospel of John, Irenæus esteemed as the lion's gospel, because in the proem the generation of the Logos from the Father is taught. Τετράμορφα τὰ ζῶα, consequently τετράμορφον καὶ τὸ εὐαγγέλιον: such is the powerful argumentation of Irenæus in behalf of the apostolic origin of the collective Gospels; and because he maintained that it must be so, he pronounced those theologians who accepted a greater or less number of canonical gospels ignorant men (μάταιοι καὶ ἀμαθεῖς), but especially impious and without any idea of the Gospel (τολμηροὶ ἀθετοῦντες τὴν ἰδέαν τοῦ εὐαγγελίου); they lay bare to the day their want of respect for the divine plan of salvation.[2] *Lücke's* question, whether Irenæus would have recognized the Fourth Gospel as the work of John if it had not been so pronounced by an old tradition, answers itself, after the specimen which we have just given, without any great difficulty. In proving the apostolic and canonical dignity of the Fourth Gospel, Irenæus appeals, not to an old tradition, but to a dogmatic necessity that was to be met. Had there not been added to the first three Gospels a fourth canonical Gospel apostolically accredited, the divine plan of salvation would have been thrown into disorder, and the indispensable conformity of the Holy Scriptures to the divine system of the world and of nature disturbed. We do not see how *Bleek*[3] draws from the reasoning of Irenæus, which seems to him "singular and whimsical," the conclusion that the conviction of the truth of these four Gospels, and of course of the Fourth Gospel as the work of John, must have been fixed firmly in the consciousness of Irenæus and the Church of his day. But Irenæus appears to have been led to a conviction of the

[1] Ps. lxxx. 1.
[2] Adv. Haer. III. 9.
[3] Commentar über das Ev. Joh. I. p. 73.

"genuineness" of the Gospels by his singular and whimsical dogmatic notions. The strongest historical evidences in favor of a fifth canonical Gospel would have produced no effect upon his mind, as the Cherubim have not five but only four faces, and there are only four quarters of the globe, and only four principal winds.[1] So little did the Christianity of that period rest on sound investigation and historical criticism.

But Irenæus had besides a special cause for judging favorably of the Fourth Gospel. It was extremely welcome to him in his controversy with the Gnostics. And therefore the remark of *Lücke* is not correct, namely, that the Antignosticism of Irenæus left him no mind for the Christian Gnosis which was in harmony with the positive faith.[2] The Fourth Gospel furnished him with weapons for the refutation of the Dualism of Cerinthus. According to the proem of the Fourth Gospel, *the Logos itself became flesh*, while of the Cerinthian Gnostics it could be said: Secundum nullam sententiam haereticorum Verbum Dei caro factum est.[3]

In examining and weighing the external evidences in relation to the origin of the Fourth Gospel, it must not pass unnoticed, that, at the beginning of the second century, the Synoptic Gospels were no longer able to meet the dogmatic want of the Gentile Christian world. A Gospel like the Fourth had become indispensable to the further development of Christian doctrine, and especially to the successful progress of the Gospel in a humanly universal direction. The idea, growing more and more general, of the divine dignity of Christ, opened the door wide to the Fourth Gospel, and, as in the case of Irenæus, soon gave it the first rank among the Gospels. Consequently in deter-

[1] [But, with his fanciful modes of thought, would not Irenæus, in the case supposed above of a fifth Gospel, have been likely to find full as good a reason for a fifth Gospel as he gives for a fourth? TRANS.]

[2] Commentar über das Ev. Joh. I. p. 73.

[3] Adv. Haer. III. 11, 3.

mining the question of its genuineness, it is only the internal evidence that can prove decisive. To what we have already said on this point, we have to add the following considerations.

It is in the highest degree improbable that the author of the Fourth Gospel was a native of Palestine, or that he was even a born Jew. The belief that, in the divine plan of salvation, the first place was to be given to the Jewish ration above all others, was altogether peculiar to the Christians of Jewish birth in the Apostolic age, and Paul, the Apostle, who had most thoroughly divested himself of Jewish prejudices, held this opinion.[1] But in the Fourth Gospel there is not a trace of it. Jesus is represented, on the other hand, to have come not to the Jews alone but to the world. The world is declared his,[2] not the Jewish people, as most commentators say in opposition to the evident connection, for, in the latter case, those to whom he gave power to become sons of God[3] could have been Jews only. The Jews, on the contrary, instantly take a position in opposition to him,[4] and those of them who believed in him[5] did so merely from the love of the miraculous, so that Jesus could put no confidence in them. The preference which the Evangelist gives to the Samaritans[6] is hard to explain from a Jewish-Christian stand-point, and the report that Jesus proclaimed himself the Messiah among the Samaritans at the very beginning of his career[7] is in direct opposition to the synoptic representation.[8] The remark that between the Jews and Samaritans there existed no intercourse,[9] implying, according to the connection, that it was forbidden to a Jew travelling through Samaria to ask water of a Samaritan woman, shows a want of knowledge in the Evangelist of the relations really existing between the Jews and Samaritans in

[1] Rom. i. 16; iii. 1, 31; ix. 1–5; xi. 1.
[2] John i. 10, 11.
[3] John i. 12.
[4] John ii. 18.
[5] John ii. 23.
[6] John iv. 5 *et seq.*
[7] John iv. 26, 39.
[8] Matt. x. 5.
[9] John iv. 9.

the time of Jesus.[1] They were not upon terms of so much hostility. The polemical treatment of the manna of the Old Testament,[2] held so sacred by the Jews that a golden pot of manna was kept in the Ark of the Covenant,[3] would be something more than remarkable from a born Jew. Surprising indeed, coming from such an one, would be the declaration that the obscure birth of Jesus was a proof of his Messianic origin,[4] conflicting, as it does, with the Jewish tradition of the time which looked for the Messiah to come from the family of David. Would a born Jew, having any knowledge of the Law, have quoted and applied a passage from the Law[5] so incorrectly as is done by this Evangelist?[6]

The errors occurring in the Fourth Gospel show that its author was not a native of Palestine, as *Baur* has remarked.[7] There is no geographical evidence of the existence of a Bethany in Peræa, mentioned in this Gospel as the sphere of the labors of the Baptist.[8] Origen, in his Commentary on this passage, has resort to the violent expedient of reading ἐν Βηθαβαρᾷ instead of ἐν Βηθανίᾳ. It is true, the Evangelist[9] gives the correct distance of the well-known Bethany from Jerusalem. But just because he was ignorant of the localities, he is not prevented at another time from placing it erroneously on the other side of the Jordan. Origen made the most minute inquiries on the spot, and not much more than a century had passed since the Fourth Gospel was written. To suppose, with *Lücke*,[10] that in this time a whole district had disappeared, leaving no trace, is scarcely credible; and to suppose with *Bleek*[11] an accidental error in the text is the more inadmissible, as the same error could not possibly have been made by all the

[1] [But even according to the Synoptics, there could have been no very hospitable intercourse between Jews and Samaritans. See Luke ix. 51. TRANS.]

[2] John vi. 31, 32.
[3] Exod. xvi. 32; Heb. ix. 4.
[4] John vii. 27.
[5] Deut. xvii. 6; xix. 5.
[6] John viii. 17.
[7] Kritische Untersuchungen, p. 331.
[8] John i. 28.
[9] John xi. 18.
[10] Commentar, p. 392.
[11] Einl. in's N. T., p. 209.

transcribers and preserved in all the copies. The error is explained only upon the supposition that the author of the Gospel, not being a Jew, was unacquainted with the geographical situation of the place mentioned.

We have an instance of the same kind in the name of the place Συχάρ[1] for the usual name Συχέμ, the chief city of Samaria. The form Συχάρ for Συχέμ occurs nowhere else, and there are no sufficient grounds for the supposition that it was a nickname.[2] When those who maintain the genuineness of this Gospel resort in this instance also to a supposed corruption of the text or mispronunciation,[3] or, with *Meyer*, seize upon the idea that Sychar was a considerable city in the vicinity of Sichem,[4] — this is only cutting the knot, not untying it. If the author of the Fourth Gospel were a Gentile Christian, unacquainted with the geography of Palestine, the error explains itself. It is remarkable also, that neither Josephus nor any other writer of the time makes mention of a pool named Bethesda;[5] and the allegorizing interpretation of the name of the pool of Siloam,[6] which could be meant only for the Greek reader, indicates the culture of Alexandria rather than Palestine. The repeated assertion that Caiaphas was High Priest the year that Jesus suffered (ἀρχιερεὺς ὢν τοῦ ἐνιαυτοῦ ἐκείνου),[7] in connection with the episode of the hearing before Annas,[8] leaves a doubt in candid minds whether the Evangelist did not connect with that assertion a belief in an annual change of the office of High Priest; and when *Meyer*[9] remarks, on the other hand, that such a belief is not to be attributed even to a "Pseudo-John," we call to mind much greater blunders made by the author of the Epistle to the Hebrews in relation to Jewish institutions far more generally known.[10] When, moreover,

[1] John iv. 5. [2] With reference to Is. xxviii. 1; Sirach l. 27.
[3] *Bleek*, p. 209.
[4] *Meyer*, ex. Handbuch, p. 160; see also *Ewald*, Jahrbücher, VIII., p. 255.
[5] John v. 2. [6] John ix. 7.
[7] John xi. 49, 51; xviii. 13. [8] John xviii. 13.
[9] Ex. Handbuch, p. 381. [10] Heb. ix. 4.

we consider further the peculiar way in which the Evangelist speaks of the Jewish Feasts, which to a born Jew were as familiar as his own household affairs, (*τὸ πάσχα τῶν Ἰουδαίων*,[1]) (*ἡ ἑορτὴ τῶν Ἰουδαίων*,[2]) (*ἡ ἑορτὴ τῶν Ἰουδαίων ἡ σκηνοπηγία*,[3]) (*τὸ πάσχα τῶν Ἰουδαίων*,[4]) we are only confirmed in the supposition that he was not of Jewish descent.

Another very considerable point is the difference between the Synoptics and the Fourth Gospel in regard to the day on which Jesus suffered death. So much is certain beyond all doubt, that if, according to the Synoptics, Jesus actually observed a formal Paschal Supper with his disciples on the evening of the 14th of the month Nisan and was crucified on the 15th, the Fourth Evangelist, who represents Jesus as partaking of a "supper" with his disciples on the 13th of Nisan and suffering death on the Cross on the 14th, could not have been at the last supper with Jesus nor an eye witness and one of the Twelve.[5] We have already given the reasons[6] which render it very probable, in our view, that Jesus instituted "the Supper" in connection with a Paschal Supper. The modern advocates of John's authorship, with the exception of a few who exhaust themselves in vain attempts to harmonize the different accounts, take sides with the Fourth Gospel in regard to the Last Supper, and charge the Synoptics with an error. They derive their reasons therefor chiefly from the Jewish arrangements at the Passover. It certainly is not to be disputed that the observance of the 15th of Nisan was pretty nearly equal in sanctity with the observance of the Sabbath,[7] and that no business

[1] John ii. 13. [2] John v. 1. [3] John vii. 2. [4] John xi. 55.

[5] [Here again it is to be observed that no circumstantial inconsistencies should be allowed to outweigh the moral keeping of the story. That even eye-witnesses should make the greatest mistakes in regard to times and dates is far more probable than that such incidents as the thirteenth chapter of the Fourth Gospel relates should be fictitious. So undesignedly true are they to nature and to the characters and positions of the persons spoken of, that the narrative could have come only from an eye-witness. TRANS.]

[6] See ch. xxv. [7] Exod. xii.; Levit. xxiii. 7; Numb. xxviii. 18.

was permitted by the Jews to be attended to on the former occasion. For this reason, the statement of the Synoptics is pronounced to be hardly credible,[1] when they tell us that the arrest of Jesus by armed men and his examination and his crucifixion, which must according to Jewish ideas have been looked upon as a desecration of the Sabbath, all took place on the 15th of Nisan. But if legal proceedings on Sabbath or Feast days against the violators of religious laws were as inadmissible as *Bleek* maintains, how then do the authors of the Synoptics, Palestinian Jews, perfectly familiar with the Jewish institutions of their time, happen to relate, without the least hesitation, as actual events, what was so inadmissible? How comes the Palestinian tradition to represent the condemnation and death of Jesus as taking place on the 15th of the month Nisan? How comes Mark, the original Evangelist (*Urevangelist*), who obtained his information from Peter himself, to assign those events to the night of the 14th–15th of Nisan? The more carefully prepared the oldest documents were in their narrative of the last hours of Jesus, the more improbable is it that they could have erred upon such important points as the time of the institution of the Lord's Supper, and the arrest and condemnation of Jesus. If it be sought to explain the alleged error of the Synoptics by supposing that, in consequence of the "certain reference" that Jesus made, in the introduction of the Lord's Supper, to the Paschal Lamb of the Old Testament, the idea might easily have been taken that he observed this Supper on the same evening on which the Jews, according to their Law, ate the Paschal Lamb, the fact well-known to Palestinian narrators and born Jews, that the Law forbade all legal proceedings on Sabbath and Feast-days, would have prevented them from having such an idea. But *Tholuck*[2] and *Wieseler*[3] have called attention to the fact that legal proceedings by Jews against Jews must have taken place not infrequently upon ordinary Sabbaths. There is

[1] *Bleek*, Beiträge zur Evangelienkritik, p. 130.

[2] Commentar zu Joh. xiii. 1. [3] Chronolog. Synopse, p. 360.

no doubt that, according to the Fourth Gospel, the High Council determined on the Sabbath, which occurred during the Feast of Tabernacles,[1] to arrest Jesus. Legal proceedings were commenced against Jesus, also on the Sabbath, on account of his healing a blind man:[2] a formal, legal hearing in which the Pharisaic party co-operated with the High Council.[3] Even on that last day of the Feast of the Tabernacles,[4] which was observed like a Sabbath, an order was issued for the arrest of Jesus and a sitting of the Sanhedrim was held.[5] In like manner during the Feast of Dedication, a similar order was issued and an attempt made to seize Jesus.[6] A report of the same kind is found in the Synoptics, which tells us that, in consequence of a cure performed by Jesus on the Sabbath, his theocratic opponents instantly, on the Sabbath, held a meeting for the purpose of destroying him.[7] It is thus sufficiently proved that the later law of the Talmud, forbidding courts of law to sit on the Sabbath, had not attained to any authority in the time of Jesus, or was not observed with the strictness of later times. It seems very evident that an exception was made in the case of offences against religion and the theocratic law, and that the execution of persons convicted of such crimes took place on Feast days.[8] We cannot attach any great significance to the marks which, according to *Bleek's* views, the Synoptics show, to the effect that Jesus was crucified on the 14th of the month Nisan.[9] According to Luke,[10] the women, upon their return from the burial of Jesus, prepared their spices that evening, and rested in obedience to the Law the next day, which was the Sabbath. But it is Mark who tells the story correctly.[11] He tells us that not until the Sabbath was over did the women buy their sweet spices. The Gentile

[1] John vii. 32; *Bleek*, ib. p. 140; *Wieseler*, ib. pp. 329, 361.
[2] John ix. 13.
[3] John ix. 15.
[4] Levit. xxiii. 35.
[5] John vii. 37.
[6] John x. 22, 39.
[7] Mark iii. 6; Mark xii. 14.
[8] Tr. Sanhedrim, XI. 4; *Wieseler*, ib. p. 363.
[9] Beiträge, p. 136; Einl. in's N. T., p. 184.
[10] Luke xxiii. 56.
[11] Mark xv. 47; xvi. 1.

Christian Luke, has committed in his representation an offence against the Jewish observance. In the circumstance that Simon of Cyrene[1] is described as "coming from the country" evidence has been sought to prove that he must have shown traces of having been at work in the fields, and consequently that it must have been a week day. But one could have been passing by and coming from the field on the Sabbath, without having been engaged in field-labor. Why the 15th of Nisan should not have been designated as the "Fore-Sabbath" (*παρασκευή*)[2] by a Christian is the less easy to perceive, as among the early Christians, as is well-known, the day of the Crucifixion was for a considerable time distinguished as *μεγάλη* or *ἁγία παρασκευή*.

But there came into notice at a later period a peculiar circumstance, which contradicts the supposition that the Apostle John considered the 14th of Nisan as the day on which Jesus died. And yet such must have been his belief, if he were the author of the Fourth Gospel. There arose, as is known, about the year 160 a difference of opinion between the Christians of Asia Minor and the Western Churches as to the point of time at which the last Paschal Supper observed by Jesus should be commemorated. The Christians in proconsular Asia celebrated this occasion on the evening of the 14th of the month Nisan, and for the reason that Jesus had at that time eaten the Passover with his disciples. Hence they were called *Quartodecimani* (*τεσσαρεσκαιδεκατῖται*). In Rome, on the other hand, Friday of the Festal week was always observed as the day of Christ's death (dies paschae) without regard to the day of the month. In the year 160 the difference became a subject of controversy between *Polycarp* of Smyrna, who defended the Eastern observance, and Anicetus, Bishop of Rome, but without disturbing the amicable relations of the two Churches. In the year 170 the dispute was renewed among the Churches of Asia Minor themselves; and in the

[1] Mark xv. 21; Luke xxiii. 26.

[2] Mark xv. 42; Matt. xxvii. 62; Luke xxiii. 54.

year 190 the Roman Bishop Victor required the bishops of Asia Minor to give up the 14th of Nisan, and when they would not comply with the requisition, he pronounced them "heretics" and refused communion with them.

The first question now is, what was the special object of the Asiatic observance of the 14th of the month Nisan? According to a fragment in the Paschal chronicle of Apollinaris, bishop of Hierapolis, — who, as it seems, having been won over by Rome to the observance there established, had come out in Asia Minor in opposition to the Asiatic institution, — this latter appears to have been cherished from a sacred regard for the *particular day of Christ's death*. As Jesus had eaten the Paschal Lamb with his disciples on this day of the month (the 14th),[1] the churches of Asia Minor thought themselves bound to follow herein the precedent set by Jesus. Thus the cause of the prevailing observance lay not so much in the desire to follow the Jewish statute, as in a determination to hold fast to the primitive commemoration of the last Paschal Feast kept by Jesus with his disciples. It is in this way that *Eusebius* regards the matter in dispute when he derives the Asiatic observance ἐκ παραδόσεως ἀρχαιοτέρας.[2] It was celebrated as ἡ τοῦ σωτηρίου πάσχα ἑορτή, as the Passover which the Saviour himself had kept with his disciples the evening before his death. The Fast then also appears to have continued, according to the Asiatic practice, only till the evening of the 14th of Nisan, while, according to the Roman custom, it ended only with the dawn of Easter morning.

Looking at the dispute merely on the external, historical side, we conclude that the Asiatics had the right of the question in so far as they held inviolably to the *day* of the month on which Jesus kept the last Paschal Supper. But after the year 170 the question appears to have taken a *dogmatico*-ritual coloring. According to the representation

[1] Chron. Pasch. ed. Dindorf, I., p. 14; ὅτι τῇ ιδ' τὸ προβατον μετὰ τῶν μαθητῶν ἔφαγεν ὁ κύριος.

[2] Hist. Eccles. V. 26.

in Eusebius, the controversy turned mainly on the point, on what day of Passion week the Fast, i. e. the expression of public mourning for sin, should end, and the sacred festal jubilee, the expression of joy at the reconciliation and deliverance effected by the death of Christ, should begin. In regard to this point, Eusebius appeals to the Apostolic tradition: *ὡς μηδ' ἑτέρᾳ προσήκειν παρὰ τὴν τῆς ἀναστάσεως τοῦ σωτῆρος ἡμῶν ἡμέραι (ἡμέρᾳ) τὰς νηστείας ἐπιλύεσθαι*, i. e. to the fact that the Fast, according to the custom, always terminated only with the dawn of Easter morning. At this point the subject in dispute strikes deeper, for the question now discussed is, whether the observance of the Lord's Supper were at the same time the commemoration of the victory of Jesus over sin and death, i. e. whether the festal jubilee of the redeemed might and should resound on the 14th of Nisan, or whether this victory had first been won only by the resurrection of Jesus, and hence might and should be celebrated only with the dawn of Easter?

The question thus brought into consideration the significance of the Supper instituted by Jesus on the 14th of Nisan, and, as closely connected therewith, the religious dignity of the day on which the institution took place. A decisive conclusion could be certainly arrived at only upon historical grounds. It depended above all things upon the design of the Lord himself in the institution, but this could be ascertained — according to the views of that day — only from Apostolic tradition. And therefore *Polycrates*, bishop of *Ephesus*, in a letter addressed, in the name of the Asiatic churches, to Victor, bishop of Rome, appeals to the testimony of the Apostle John to prove that the 14th of Nisan (*ἡ ἡμέρα ὅταν ὁ λαὸς ἤρτυε τὴν ζύμην*) had been observed as a feast in uninterrupted succession from the time of the Apostles.[1] Thus the 14th of Nisan was, in his belief, the day appointed by God for the Christian Paschal Feast, and, according to the well-known Apostolic declaration, one must obey God rather than men. *Irenæus*, who was on the side

[1] Euseb. Hist. Eccles. V. 27.

of the Roman Church, but condemned Victor's passionate treatment of the question, acknowledged, in a writing addressed to Victor in the name of the Gallican Church, that the Asiatic churches stood on the ground of Apostolic tradition (he designates them as *ἐκκλησίας θεοῦ ἀρχαίου ἔθους παράδοσιν ἐπιτηρούσας*), and that Church communion should not be denied them on account of a ritual difference. But he indicated the point in dispute more sharply than had been done previously, when he declared that the difference to be settled was not as to the day of observance (whether the 14th of Nisan or not), but as to the duration of the Fast observed in Passion week (*περὶ τοῦ εἴδους αὐτοῦ τῆς νηστείας*). The Asiatic Christians fasted during a shorter time than the Roman, probably only on the day preceding the observance of the Lord's Supper (*οἱ μὲν γὰρ οἴονται μίαν ἡμέραν δεῖν αὐτοὺς νηστεύειν*, — where the *οἱ μέν* are, according to the connection, most probably the Asiatics). While Irenæus reminded Victor of the friendly and peaceful way in which his predecessor, Anicetus, dealt with Polycarp of Smyrna in reference to the same subject, he testified also at the same time to the fact that Polycarp held firmly to the Asiatic custom, and indeed by the authority of the Apostle John and the other Apostles.

The Asiatic observance cannot possibly have been what *Bleek* represents it, when he supposes that the Asiatic Christians observed "the Passover of the Jews" (so far as that could be done at a distance from the Temple and after the destruction thereof) by substituting ordinary mealtimes for the Paschal Supper strictly so called.[1] This would have been not a Christian but a Jewish celebration, not a proper Paschal solemnity; and it is enough to state, in opposition to this view, that Eusebius calls the Passover upon which the controversy turned *ἡ τοῦ σωτηρίου πάσχα ἑορτή*, — that Polycrates of Ephesus remarks in reference to the same that the Asiatics had always celebrated the Passover on the 14th of the month Nisan according to the

[1] Einl. in's in N. T., p. 190.

Gospel (κατὰ τὸ εὐαγγέλιον), i. e. as a Christian ceremony, — and that finally, even according to Irenæus, the cardinal point of the controversy was the duration of the Fast.

Now as to the connection of the Paschal controversy with the question concerning the origin of the Fourth Gospel, the important fact is that the 14th of the month Nisan was undoubtedly observed by the Asiatic churches as the day of the institution of the Supper by Jesus. Consequently the 15th was considered as the day on which Jesus died, — a fact made conspicuous, as the characteristic distinction of the Asiatic celebration, by Apollinaris of Hierapolis in the first fragment of the Paschal Chronicle.[1] It is equally beyond dispute that the Apostle John was regarded as the most important witness in defence of this mode of celebrating the Feast, and that men like Polycarp of Smyrna, who were personal pupils and admirers of the Apostle, appealed especially to his authority, and would have considered it a sin against God himself, i. e. against the divine arrangement, to depart from this Apostolic rite. How then is it to be explained that an Apostle, who solemnly distinguished the 14th of Nisan as the commemoration day of the institution of the Supper by Jesus, and held the 15th to be the day of the Crucifixion, should nevertheless write a Gospel in which there is no mention of the Supper, and in which it is assumed that the 14th was the day on which Jesus died? To meet this grave contradiction, *Bleek* has nothing to offer but a supposition no less irreconcilable with the original documents (as we have shown) than improbable in itself, — namely, that the Asiatic Christians kept the *Jewish* Passover, and that the memory of the last supper of the Lord (as is self-evident of course) was for a considerable length of time (but how long?) not at all the principal point in view. *Bleek* is further of the opinion that, although John knew that Jesus did not observe the last familiar supper at the time legally set for the Jewish Passover, yet this circumstance could not induce John to make himself an exception to what had

[1] *Weitzel*, Die Christliche Paschafeier, p. 22 *et passim*.

come to be the custom. But the Apostle John was not by any means an ordinary member of the Christian body, who simply conformed to the prevailing practice. He was looked up to by the churches of Asia Minor as a supreme apostolic authority. He was their model and leader. He could not possibly have left them in uncertainty upon a point so important as the day of the Institution of the Supper and of the death of Jesus. If he felt himself moved in his Gospel to contradict in writing, indirectly at least, the statement of the Synoptics, it is more than improbable that he would have omitted to instruct orally the churches under his Apostolic charge in regard to the error that had crept in among them. Who so well able to give such instruction as he, the eye-witness and partaker of the first Supper? And finally, how is the participation of the Apostle John in a Jewish Passover to be reconciled, if he were the author of the Fourth Gospel, with the so decidedly anti-Jewish character of this Gospel?

It is only by accepting the learned and acute inferences of *Steitz*,[1] according to which the churches of Asia Minor commemorated the death of Jesus on the 14th of Nisan as the true Christian Passover,[2] that the representation could possibly be reconciled with the authorship of John. But we gather from the original reports in the most explicit manner that the Asiatic Christians were really of opinion that Jesus kept the Jewish Paschal Supper with his disciples on the evening of the 14th of Nisan. We do not see, moreover, why the Roman Christians should have taken offence at the Asiatic Church for sacredly observing the day of Christ's death as such.[3]

But if Jesus really kept the Paschal Supper on the evening of the 14th of Nisan with his disciples, the question remains, Why did the author of the Fourth Gospel, in contradiction to

[1] Studien und Kritiken, 1855, p. 716 *et seq.*; 1856, p. 721; *Herzog's* Real-Encyclopädie, Art. Pascha. [2] 1 Cor. v. 7.

[3] *Zeller*, Theol. Jahrbücher, 1849, p. 209; 1857, p. 523; *Hilgenfeld*, Der Paschastreit, p. 5.

the Synoptics and the Asiatic observance, put the Last Supper on the evening of the 13th and the Crucifixion on the 14th? That the statement of mere outward events was not the Evangelist's chief aim, we have already shown. He gives the discourses of Jesus in a form in which he could not have uttered them. He represents Jesus as quitting Galilee at the commencement of his career and choosing Judea as the scene of his labors, which runs against the Synoptics and against all probability. He puts the purification of the Temple at the beginning of the public life of Jesus. He represents the disciples as recognizing the Messiah and a manifestation of the divine Logos in Jesus at first sight, while a considerable period elapsed before they attained to a higher appreciation of the significance of the person of Jesus and of his office. The representation of the Fourth Gospel departs throughout from that of the other Evangelists. Now, although the fourth Evangelist differs from the three others in reference to the day of the death of Jesus, this by itself is not remarkable. He has dogmatic aims to serve. His special object is to ground his readers in the faith that Jesus as the Christ, the Son of God, was the manifestation of the Logos in the flesh, and through this faith to plant the life eternal in the Christian Communion.[1] The author of the Fourth Gospel evidently appears to have taken the same dogmatic point of view taken by Apollinaris of Hierapolis in the Paschal Chronicle, when he conceives of Christ as the true Passover, and his death on the cross as the true Paschal sacrifice, and thus sees in this event the actual fulfilment of one of the most important types of the Old Testament.[2] In the words of Apollinaris, quoted below, there is expressed the same sharp opposition to Judaism which runs through the whole Fourth Gospel. Jesus could not therefore, from this point of view, have kept any Paschal

[1] John xx. 31.

[2] See the Chron. Paschale, ib.: *ἡ ιδ' τὸ ἀληθινὸν τοῦ κυρίου πάσχα, ἡ θυσία ἡ μεγάλη, ὁ ἀντὶ τοῦ ἀμνοῦ παῖς θεοῦ ὁ δεθεὶς, ὁ δήσας τὸν ἰσχυρὸν, . . . καὶ ὁ ταφεὶς ἐν ἡμέρᾳ τῇ τοῦ πάσχα.*

Supper properly so called, as it would have been virtually making confession, before his death, of Judaism. The Jewish types, circumcision and the Passover, have, in the moment of their true fulfilment through his all-consummating death,[1] no longer any signification either for him or for Christians. If he was in himself on the Cross the true Paschal lamb, he could not have solemnly partaken of a false one before his death on the Cross. From this point of view, the idea that Jesus celebrated a Jewish Passover at that time certainly appeared to the fourth Evangelist as an internal dogmatic impossibility; and hence his representation is but the offspring of an unavoidable dogmatic necessity, requiring Jesus in his last hours to be represented as wholly free from Jewish prejudices. How anxious the Evangelist was to give his readers the impression that Jesus suffered as the true Paschal lamb, is proved by the importance which he attaches to the circumstance that, after the Crucifixion, not a bone in the body of Jesus was broken.[2] Thus in him was fulfilled the requirement in regard to the Paschal lamb.[3] From the point of view of this Gospel, there could no longer be any doubt that he was the true Messiah, the Fulfiller of the Old Covenant. But there was in Jesus a much deeper significance than in the merely typical lamb of the Old Covenant. In the mention, made by the fourth Evangelist, of the blood and water that flowed from the dead body of Jesus upon its being pierced by the spear, he intends doubtless to point to one of the great miracles by which Jesus was glorified; on which account the commentators might easily have spared themselves both the natural explanations of this circumstance and the medical dissertations down even to the sugillations and extravasations of Dr. Ebrard.[4] Blood and water, i. e. the blood of the crucified Jesus and the water of Baptism are, according to the Evangelist, the two means of grace by which salvation is accomplished under the new Covenant. Whosoever eats the flesh of the

[1] John xix. 30. [2] John xix. 33. [3] Exod. xii. 46.
[4] Wissenschaftliche Kritik, 2, A. p. 563.

Son of Man and *drinks his blood* has eternal life,[1] and whosoever *drinks of the water* which he gives will never thirst again.[2] Thus the faith that Jesus suffered death as the true lamb of the Passover on the 14th of Nisan serves, not only to make him appear to fulfil the Old Testament types, consummating the divine plan of salvation in the due order of its historical development, and thus to confirm the conviction of his Messianic office, but also to call to mind the means of grace, the blood of reconciliation, and the water of purification,[3] by which the death of Jesus is rendered effectual in believers. The Christian school, in which the Fourth Gospel had its origin, and which was in unmistakable connection with the doctrinal ideas of John, had of course forsaken the purely historical stand-point of the Apostle. The pupils had gone beyond their master. That historical interests had to yield to dogmatic views was in accord with the age which followed upon that of the Apostles. The great object then was to establish and maintain at any price a full faith in the Son of God and his essential divinity. And in the fire of enthusiasm which this faith kindled, the objections and demurs of a wholly uneducated historical criticism were consumed.

The conclusion to which our investigation plainly points is this: Mark is the most authentic source of the Evangelical history, while Matthew and Luke contain exaggerations and variations attributable to the later tradition, and the fourth Evangelist subordinates the historical to the dogmatic interest. For the predominance of the legendary element even in the second Gospel, notwithstanding its connection with the statements of Peter, a twofold cause is at hand. When Mark had once freely elaborated the reports of Peter, and written his Gospel under the influence of the Apostolic tradition orally delivered and of the demand for the marvellous in the Apostolic Communion, Peter himself also, following Old Testament precedents, may have set many of

[1] John vi. 54. [2] John iv. 14.

[3] See also *Baur*, Krit. Untersuchungen, p. 215 *et seq.*

the evangelical occurrences in a miraculous light. The elaborator of the original Mark has likewise here and there mingled the later stories with the earlier reports. In what particular instances this has been done, cannot now be determined with any precision.

[We gather from the remarks of Dr. Schenkel in the foregoing note upon the "blood and water" stated to have flowed from the dead body of Jesus when it was pierced by the spear, that he considers this circumstance as invented by the author of the Fourth Gospel under the stress of a strong dogmatic bias. If it were so, if it were imagined and introduced only for the sake of the symbolical significance of the blood and water, it is remarkable that the narrator makes no comment, gives us no hint of its meaning, but only asseverates the fact with singular emphasis. It is very probable that he was struck with the typical import of the fact, but he makes, — he hints no such use of it. The fact is far from being incredible in itself, as there is decisive medical evidence going to show the rapid and copious accumulation of water, the formation of *Hydrocele*, immediately consequent upon extreme physical agony. (For an account of a number of striking cases in point, see *American Journal of the Medical Sciences, New Series, Vol. XIII. pp.* 85 *and* 365. *Philadelphia,* 1847.)

Dr. Schenkel's learned discussion of the difference between the Fourth Gospel and the other three Gospels in regard to the institution of the Lord's Supper and the observance of the last Passover by Jesus, is based upon the supposition that Jesus solemnly designed to institute the Supper and to abolish the Jewish Passover by the sacrifice of himself as the true Paschal lamb. But, as I have elsewhere observed (see Note to ch. xxv.), I can see no evidence of any design on the part of Jesus to institute a rite, and his representation of his blood as "the blood of the new testament" (or covenant) appears to have been an allusion of the moment suggested by the occasion. He does not

dwell upon this representation, nor does he repeat it. If he intended to found a distinguishing institution, the omission of all notice of it in the Fourth Gospel is inexplicable; but it is easily accounted for upon the supposition that the incident in relation to the bread and wine was a mere passing incident of the evening instead of being, as Dr. Schenkel and other critics understand it, the founding of a solemn symbolical ceremony. As for the difference of dates between the Fourth Gospel and the Synoptics, it is a great deal easier to suppose at once that an error early crept into the text of the former than that what is related in the thirteenth chapter of the Fourth Gospel did not occur as there represented. — TRANS.]

3. p. 61. The account in Luke[1] of the first visit of Jesus, in his boyhood, to the Temple is regarded by *Strauss*[2] and others as a myth. Strauss admits that the journey of Jesus to Jerusalem at twelve years of age, his eagerness to learn, and his interest in the Temple, are not in themselves improbable. But, as, according to Jewish ideas and customs, the twelfth year marked a new period in the life of man, and as, when there is no authentic historical evidence at hand in regard to the early signs of greatness in great men, fictitious stories of their youth are apt to go abroad, and as, finally, the evangelical narrator represents the parents of Jesus as not understanding what he meant in his reference to his Father's house, Strauss decides the whole story to be a fiction. *Weisse* too, considers himself bound to confess,[3] that he cannot understand this passage save as a myth; for, when Jesus gave such an answer to his parents,[4] either the natural laws of human development were disregarded, or Jesus must have caught the idea of his mission as the Messiah in a light, childish way. *Hilgenfeld* finds even in that answer the idea of the divine Sonship, and not only so, but the divine Sonship as the essential point of the answer, and as

[1] Luke ii. 41.
[2] Leben Jesu, § 36.
[3] Ev. Geschichte, I., p. 212.
[4] Luke ii. 49.

thus put, in its superhuman character, in opposition to the consciousness of Jesus as a human son.[1] But *Ernest Renan* throws the narrative back into the region of the legendary.[2] With reference to such representations *Hase* has justly remarked[3] that, although the incident is not vouched for by Apostolic testimony, yet *it makes on the reader the full impression of historical truth.* Luke himself without doubt took the narrative, so free from all marvellous exaggerations, from some written work of the older tradition.[4] For the later tradition would not have failed to amplify it and dress it up with miraculous embellishments. The assertion of Strauss, that, because tradition now and then mixes up with the early history of great men fabulous accounts of signs and presentiments of greatness, the story told by Luke of such a presentiment in Jesus must be a fable, proves too much, especially since, according to the admission of Strauss, such fictions appear only when historical truth is wanting. That historical truth is not at hand in the present instance, *Strauss* has not attempted to show. The several features of the narrative, taken together, are characterized by an artless simplicity: the inquisitiveness of the child Jesus, the wonder of the teachers, the pain and anxiety of the parents, the sense of security with which Jesus bears himself, — all is genuinely human. There is no trace in him of anything like a consciousness of a superhuman Sonship, in opposition to his consciousness of being the child of human parents. Like any other pious Jewish child, he calls God his Father, but he renders to his earthly parents the obedience which was their due.

4. p. 75. According to the common belief John really recognized Jesus as the Messiah; and, as *Neander* thinks,[5]

[1] Die Evangelien, p. 159.

[2] *Vie de Jésus*, p. 42. He remarks in this relation: "La *légende* se plaît à le montrer dès son enfance en révolte contre l'autorité paternelle et sortant des voies communes pour suivre sa vocation."

[3] Leben Jesu, 4. A., p. 57. [4] Luke i. 2.

[5] Leben Jesu Christi, p. 83 *et seq.*

in consequence "of a subjective revelation made directly to John by the Divine Spirit." Neander consequently regards the account of the synoptical Gospels as a fabulous embellishment; that which John declared to be a fact real to himself became objective as related by others. According to our view, on the contrary, the later legend spiritualizes the earlier more matter-of-fact tradition. But from Neander's point of view, it is, historically considered, inexplicable how the Baptist should have at once pronounced Jesus — who, until that moment, was wholly unknown to him — to be the Messiah. If this were the case through an instantaneous, physiologically immediate, divine revelation, it is unintelligible that the impression of this illumination should have been so slight that, at a later period, John should have lost all recollection of it.[1] It is equally unaccountable why, after such a vision had been accorded him, he did not at once cease to insist upon the necessity of repenting and fasting, and dwell upon the importance of embracing the salvation offered in the person of Jesus. No apologist has as yet solved the physiological enigma, namely, how it happened that John directed others to Jesus as the fulfilment of the Old Testament promises, but held fast himself to the Old Testament idea, and kept his own disciples standing at the point which, he declared, had been passed. The fine historical sense of Neander has recognized the weight of this difficulty.[2] It is not in the least degree met by the suggestion which Neander makes, that John had taken his appointed stand, beyond which he did not feel free to advance; had he attached himself to Jesus, there would have been nothing gained thereby for the cause of Jesus. The difficulty is essentially of a physiological nature. It does not relate to the scheme of salvation. If, whether by an outward miracle, or in consequence of an inward illumination, John was convinced of the Messiahship of Jesus, and if, for the purpose of interesting others in Jesus, he

[1] Matt. xi. 12; Luke vii. 18.

[2] Neander, ib. p. 85.

made a public declaration of his faith, then, neither in relation to his external usefulness nor to his inner life, was there any reason why he should keep himself and his disciples aloof from Jesus. By so doing, he could be of no use to him and his cause. On the contrary, it would inevitably have produced a very unfavorable impression.

But it is in itself in a high degree improbable that John, with his ideas of the Messiah, should have recognized that personage in Jesus, who until then was wholly unknown to him. In the description of John given by Josephus, there is at first sight no allusion to the Messianic hopes of his countrymen[1] in relation to John. According to Josephus, John was a whole-souled man, who labored as a teacher of virtue among the Jews, and by means of baptism engaged them to the practice of righteousness towards man and piety towards God; baptism consequently having the significance not of an expiation securing forgiveness (which was the popular idea of sacrifice), but of a symbol expressive of a moral pledge.[2]

But when Josephus further relates that a great popular excitement was caused by the preaching of John (ἥρθησαν ἐπὶ πλεῖστον τῇ ἀκροάσει τῶν λόγων), when he mentions the anxiety of Herod Antipas lest a revolt (ἀπόστασις), an innovation (νεώτερόν τι ἐξ αὐτοῦ), a revolution (μεταβολή) might be produced by John, it is very natural to infer,[3] that John announced the approach of the Messianic kingdom in a way that occasioned uneasiness in the Roman party.[4] But the statement of Josephus serves also to show that John's expectation of the Messiah had a decided theocratic coloring. How then could he have recognized the Messiah in Jesus of Nazareth, unknown, nameless, and without demur pro-

[1] Ant. XVIII. 5, 2.

[2] See the description of Josephus: Οὕτω γὰρ καὶ τὴν βάπτισιν ἀποδεκτὴν αὐτῷ (θεῷ) φανεῖσθαι, μὴ ἐπί τινων ἁμαρτάδων παρατήσει χρωμένων, ἀλλ' ἐφ' ἁγνείᾳ τοῦ σώματος, ἅτε δὴ καὶ τῆς ψυχῆς δικαιοσύνῃ προεκκεκαθαρμένης.

[3] *E. Gerlach*, Die Weissagungen des A. T. in den Schriften des Josephus, p. 116.

[4] Mark i. 7; Matt. iii. 8; Luke iii. 16.

claimed him as the Messiah of the people? Granting that it is on the one hand very probable that John connected with his Baptism the idea of the approaching Messiah's kingdom, it is on the other hand just as unlikely that he went any further than is stated in the book of Acts,[1] where we are told that he baptized the people into the faith of him who should come after him (εἰς τὸν ἐρχόμενον μετ' αὐτόν). That by "him who was to come" Jesus was meant, is an interpretation of the Apostle Paul's from his point of view as a Christian.

With still greater difficulties is the question embarrassed: Why did Jesus suffer himself to be baptized by John? *Ernest Renan* represents the relation in which the two stood to one another in such a light that Jesus had already founded his school when he undertook to go to the Baptist,[2] an idea which finds no support whatever, as *Renan* supposes, in John iii. 22.[3] Besides, the first three Gospels give a more correct account of the relation of Jesus to John than the fourth Gospel. According to *Renan*, the two worked together as associates for a while,[4] and he even represents Jesus as for a time subordinate to John and as taking John for a model.[5] Upon this view, it certainly is very easy to understand how Jesus came to submit himself to the baptism of John. But *Renan's* representation is lacking in any solid philosophical basis. There is not in the Gospels the slightest intimation that Jesus ever joined the circle of John's disciples, and this notion *Renan* himself entirely refutes when he represents Jesus as of equal age with John, and as possessed of a profound originality of mind.

But other modern attempts to explain the baptism of Jesus by John have proved alike unsatisfactory. The sup-

[1] Acts xix. 4.

[2] Vie de Jésus, p. 104.

[3] Comp. John i. 19 *et seq.*

[4] Ib. p. 106: Les deux jeunes enthousiastes, pleins des mêmes espérances et des mêmes haines, ont bien pu faire cause commune et s'appuyer réciproquement.

[5] Ib. p. 107: Il semble que, malgré sa profonde originalité Jesus, durant quelques semaines ou moins, fut l'imitateur (!) de Jean.

position that, when Jesus was baptized, John's Baptism had, in becoming Christian Baptism, taken the significance of a vow and a dedication of the baptized to the Messiah,[1] finds no support in the original authorities. And it does not appear how Jesus could have made a vow to John, who was less than the least in the kingdom of heaven. Equally impossible is it, that he could by a formal act have consecrated himself to his Messianic office, as he had not then attained to any full clearness in his own mind in regard to that office. Granting even that John's Baptism was designed to symbolize for all the people the inauguration of the Messianic age, and thus necessarily served as a formal dedication to the Messiah,[2]— which is not true without qualification.— yet it was by no means requisite that the Messiah himself should observe this ceremony, and, least of all, such a Messiah as Jesus, whose office it was to put a full end to the whole fabric of Jewish formalities. *Baumgarten*[3] and *Ewald*[4] have come nearest to the correct view of the baptism of Jesus; the former in bringing into view the pure love of Jesus, which moved him, in the consciousness of his humanity and nationality, to raise the nation from its sins and impurities to his own holy state; and the latter when he remarks that no living member of the Christian Communion was at liberty, according to his higher duty, to keep aloof from the Baptist, not even "he who was to come," but was not yet the Messiah. Besides, the baptism of Jesus by John ceases to offend the Christian consciousness, when the later tradition representing it as connected with the forgiveness of sins is acknowledged to be untenable. As a genuine Israelite, as a faithful citizen and friend of his country, as a true man, as one of the people feeling profoundly with them, Jesus, without any violation of conscience, could unite with the better part of the people in confessing the general guilt, and bind himself to the service of

[1] *Hase*, Leben Jesu, p. 85.
[2] *Neander*, ib. p. 72.
[3] Geschichte Jesu, p. 43.
[4] Geschichte Christus, 2, A. p. 186.

righteousness just as well as without any feeling inconsistent with truth, he could pray, Forgive us *our* sins, *our* debts.[1]

[I am free to say, that from my "point of view," I cannot perceive any of these difficulties that embarrass the critics so much in regard to the relations of John the Baptist and Jesus. To repeat what I have already stated, John came forth as a public *censor morum*, urgently moved thereto by his own fervid temperament, by a sense of the gross degeneracy of the times, and by a deep conviction that the wrath of God was impending over the nation. He read in the signs of the time the coming kingdom, which was figured to his earnest spirit as the coming of the Lord to punish the people for their sins. The axe, as he said, was already lying at the root of the trees. Naturally he summoned the people to amend their lives, to cleanse themselves, and in token thereof to bathe or be baptized in the neighboring river. His Baptism was in no sense a sign of formal adhesion to the person of the Baptist. Only a very few became personal disciples of John.

Jesus went to the Baptist to devote himself to that high ideal of duty which had for years been steadily dawning upon his soul, to cleanse himself from every weakness that would keep him back from actualizing his great purpose. It was his first public step.

As the tradition is that Jesus and John were kinsmen, and as there are many intimations of the high personal estimation in which they held one another, I cannot doubt that they were personal acquaintances. But they were individual, original men. And is it not very conceivable that John may have had great admiration for Jesus, — may have felt that he was destined to a great work, and might prove to be the Messiah, and was indeed the Messiah, and yet that the Baptist, intensely individual as he was, did not feel himself called upon to cease from his peculiar work, and go and follow Jesus? His idea of the Messiah was doubtless the popular

[1] Luke xi. 4; Matt. vi. 12.

idea of the time, the theocratic idea, and he felt himself to be working in harmony with that, and preparing the people for the reign of the Messiah, whenever the Messiah should appear. When he was thrown into prison — and how must the spirit of such a man have chafed under confinement — he heard of Jesus; but no tidings came to him of anything said or done by Jesus in conformity with the idea of the king that he looked for, and therefore he doubted whether Jesus were really "he that should come." TRANS.]

5. p. 96. One of the gravest problems in the Evangelical History is, beyond all dispute, contained in the question, How did Jesus come to decide upon his public work, and to choose his Messianic calling? Our mode of representing him rejects the popular idea that Jesus had formed a "plan" of saving mankind and followed it out in his public career. *E. Renan* certainly goes much too far when he describes Jesus as entering upon his public life entirely without a plan, and as invested by the admiring multitude with the title of Messiah.[1] But *Keim*[2] has well remarked that the inner act of Jesus was not the birth of an hour, but must have been the "growth of a life." It is the special merit of *Ewald*,[3] that he has kept in mind this psychological development, although his preference for the fourth Gospel has seriously embarrassed his understanding of it in detail. In the fourth Gospel Jesus thinks and acts, from the first moment of his appearance in public, as the Messiah. In the first three Gospels, on the other hand, there is no allusion to the Messiah in connection with the first announcement of the fulfilment of time and the coming of the kingdom of heaven. The appearance of Jesus, moreover, at the beginning of his public labors, shows none of the marks by which the Mes-

[1] Vie de Jésus, pp. 132 – 33: Comme le Messie devait être fils de David, on lui décernait naturellement ce titre. . . . . Jésus se le laissait donner avec plaisir, quoiqu'il lui causât quelque embarras (!).

[2] *Keim*, Die Menschliche Entwickelung Jesu Christi, p. 24.

[3] Geschichte Christus, p. 146 *et seq.*

siah was to be authenticated. People were astonished at his "teaching," but mainly for the convincing power which accompanied it,[1] and not because it met the popular expectations of the Messiah. Even the unclean spirit in Capernaum addresses him by the simple title of "Jesus of Nazareth," and designates him as a holy man of God.[2] At a still later period in his career, his Messianic office was not generally recognized, but the people held him to be the Baptist risen from the dead, or one of the old prophets.[3] And even the disciples themselves, according to the Synoptics, did not attain until at a later period, and even then to the surprise of Jesus, to a recognition of his Messiahship.[4]

If now, as certain passages in the Synoptics represent, Jesus was from the first acknowledged as the Messiah, there is only the more ground for the view taken by *Schneckenburger*, namely, that these passages have been obscured by tradition.[5] With the recollection of the fact that Jesus first proclaimed himself the Messiah towards the close of his life there was connected the dogmatic aim of the reporter, making Jesus to arrive as early as possible at the conscious possession of that dignity. But as it is certain that a considerable space of time elapsed, after he appeared in public, before he openly declared his Messiahship, there is no authority for the supposition that he had secretly regarded himself as the Messiah for some time before, but from external considerations had kept silent about it, and bound those who knew him to be the Messiah to keep silence also. Such a supposition is altogether at variance with the singleness, openness, and strength of character which Jesus showed whenever he was called upon to be true to a conviction. On the other hand, in the fact that Jesus did not immediately upon his first appearance regard his work as Messianic, there is nothing derogatory to the elevation of his mind or the singleness of

[1] Mark i. 22; Matt. vii. 28; Luke iv. 32.
[2] Mark i. 23; Luke iv. 34.
[3] Mark viii. 27; Matt. xvi. 13. [4] Matt. xvi. 16.
[5] Ueber den Ursprung der ersten Kan. Evangelium, p. 28.

his character.[1] As in childhood, so as a man he steadily grew, uninterruptedly learning obedience to the Divine will, — as was acknowledged even in the subsequent Apostolic time,[2] — purifying and perfecting himself to fulfil the work laid on him by God. While *Neander* infers from "the right understanding of the history of the Temptation"[3] that Jesus had at the first the whole plan of his work clearly portrayed to his consciousness, directly the reverse is shown by the legend of the Temptation, especially according to the intimation contained in the third Gospel, namely, that the moral and spiritual process in the soul of the Saviour was completed only with his death. Only thus does he appear as a real man, engaged in a continuous struggle with the conditions and limitations of this earthly being; only thus is he an historically intelligible personality, to be conceived of and represented.

There is seen here, moreover, a very important reason, never yet observed to our knowledge, why Jesus could not at the first consider and declare himself the Messiah. The Messianic idea, as it had been historically formed, was most intimately interwoven with the national theocratic expectations, and it was precisely these that Jesus had to oppose in the strongest manner. Hence he was at the first conscious only of his opposition to the popular idea of the Messiah. The conviction that he was to fulfil that idea in his own person was the result only of a ripening experience, of continued labor; and thus only was it rendered possible for him to declare his Messiahship. Why his declaration was variously misunderstood is likewise, under such circumstances, easily to be explained. He lacked all the marks which the Messianic ideas required.

6. p. 103. In accordance with the disposition, prevalent even among our later theologians, to harmonize the Gospels, the accounts which the fourth Gospel gives of the call-

[1] Comp. *Strauss*, Leben Jesu, § 58.

[2] Phil. ii. 8; Heb. v. 8.

[3] *Neander*, ib. p. 117.

ing of the disciples is wont to be brought as closely as possible into agreement with the representations of the Synoptics. Thus *Neander*[1] is of opinion, that the first company of disciples gained by Jesus in Peræa after his baptism accompanied him thence back to Galilee, but did not give in their final adhesion to him until he took a new occasion to draw to him those whom he had called, and that then he summoned them to the full duty of their calling, and to unconditional devotion to his person. *Hase*[2] likewise in a similar way supposes a double calling of the disciples, and explains the difference between the fourth Gospel and the three other Gospels by supposing that oral tradition preserved only the second calling. *Ewald*,[3] on the other hand, gives up the attempt to harmonize the two accounts. He concedes that the calling of the two pairs of brothers is represented as having taken place not in Peræa, but at the lake of Gennesaret, and explains this by the whole plan of "the older form of the narration," according to which the first public appearance of Jesus occurred at a somewhat later time. But he finds himself compelled to suppose an earlier and rather undefined connection between the disciples and Jesus in Peræa. *Meyer*[4] again, justly perceives that the Synoptic account is wholly irreconcilable with that of the fourth Gospel in time, place, and circumstance, and rightly directs attention to the fact that the account, according to which in the fourth Gospel only a provisional calling of disciples took place, conflicts with the fourth Evangelist, who represents the disciples as accompanying Jesus to Cana, and as being and remaining with him uninterruptedly.[5] But when Meyer, notwithstanding this correct view, charges with "critical self-delusion" those theologians who give the preference, on the score of credibility, to the representation of the Synoptics, he appears to have sought the self-delusion in the wrong quarter. That Jesus, after receiving

[1] Leben Jesu, p. 243 *et seq.*
[2] Leben Jesu, p. 92.
[3] Geschichte Christus, p 251.
[4] Ex. Handbuch zum Ev. Joh., p. 109.
[5] John ii. 2.

baptism from John, thereby declaring that he disclaimed an independent career, and before he attained to the self-possession and suffered the conflicts, which were kept in the memory of contemporaries by the legend of the Temptation, should have called disciples, and without any further preparation announced himself to them as the Messiah promised in the Old Testament, is an account far more intelligible from a dogmatic point of view coloring the representation, than from the ground of actual facts.

7. p. 104. According to the third Gospel, Jesus began his public career in Nazareth.[1] But the Evangelist was probably led to this supposition by the fact that Nazareth was the birthplace of Jesus. In Luke's account however there are indications that the incident at Nazareth, which he relates, occurred at a later point of time. Thus we read: *αὐτὸς ἐδίδασκεν ἐν ταῖς συναγωγαῖς αὐτῶν, δοξαζόμενος ὑπὸ πάντων.*[2] This passage points to a longer previous course of teaching by Jesus in those regions, and to a reputation which could have been gained only by repeated proofs of his power as a teacher. That Jesus, in the first discourse uttered by him in his native town, should have reproached his fellow-townsmen with so much severity on account of their unbelief,[3] is the more unlikely as they are reported to have commended the grace of his words.[4] Besides, the reference he makes to the *γενόμενα εἰς τὴν Καπερναούμ* points to his previous labors in Capernaum.[5] And, finally, the attempt of "those in the synagogue" to throw him headlong from the brow of the hill,[6] has not by any means a sufficient reason in the reproaches cast by him upon the Nazarenes; and the traces of a later legend are betrayed in the impression given of an already very considerable increase of miraculous power in Jesus.[7] The report that Jesus first made his appearance in public in his native town is entirely wanting in the sec-

[1] Luke iv. 16. [2] Luke iv. 15. [3] Luke iv. 24.
[4] Luke iv. 22. [5] Luke iv. 23.
[6] Luke iv. 28. [7] Luke iv. 30.

ond Gospel, and the first states in general terms that he taught and labored, after the calling of the disciples, in Galilee and around Decapolis.[1] According to the second Gospel and the first, Jesus, at a later period, after his fame had been for some time established in Galilee, made an attempt to convert his townsmen in the Synagogue at Nazareth,[2] an attempt however which wholly failed. The third Evangelist drew the account of the incident at Nazareth not from the original Mark (*Urmarcus*), but from a later source, in which probably no time was indicated when the incident occurred. We are therefore justified in placing the commencement of the public teaching of Jesus in Capernaum.

[This note appears to me to be singularly abundant in misapprehensions. By our author's own showing, there is no ground for supposing that Luke thought or intended to give the impression that Jesus first appeared as a public teacher in Nazareth. He states explicitly, before relating the incident in Nazareth, that Jesus went forth from the desert into Galilee, and, as Dr. Schenkel quotes, "taught in their synagogues, being glorified of all." That he had previously taught in Capernaum is evident also from what Luke reports Jesus to have said in the synagogue of Nazareth. He tells us that Jesus referred to his previous labors in Capernaum. Again Dr. Schenkel thinks it improbable that Jesus should have been so severe upon his townsmen since they admired and praised the grace of his words. But was it not rather the grace and power of his manner than what he actually said that commanded their admiration? Dr. Schenkel sees no reason for the design conceived by "those in the synagogue" to fling Jesus headlong from the brow of the hill. But was there not reason enough for their "wrath" in the fact that he quoted the Old Scriptures to prove that God had, on more than one occasion, passed by Jews to favor Gentile dogs? Could anything be

[1] Matt. iv. 23. [2] Mark vi. 1; Matt. xiii. 54.

more offensive to a devout Jew — anything sound more profane, more blasphemous — than such a use of the Scriptures, every letter of which, the Jews believed, declared their people to be the chosen of heaven? Once more, I see no intimation of anything miraculous in the brief account of the escape of Jesus on the occasion. His hearers in their rage were ready to take his life, into such rage had his words stung them. But they were not instantly agreed. No one man was quite ready to lay hands on Jesus, and in the uproar he quietly slipped away. — TRANS.]

8. p. 110. The question, How far Jesus shared in the views of his time and country, and of course in their prejudices and errors in regard to matters physical, historical, political, &c., cannot be satisfactorily answered. When *E. Renan* expresses the opinion that Jesus shared in all the superstitious notions of the age, and gives us the good advice, Supprimons dans nos instructions religieuses la *chimère* qui en fut l'ame,[1] he is bound to give us proof of the correctness of this opinion. We should, at all events, distinguish between the scientific ideas and the moral and religious convictions of Jesus. There is just as little reason to suppose that he had a critical acquaintance with the origin of the book of Daniel, as there is obligation to submit ourselves to his authority in the respects in which he had no desire to be an authority to us. Generally speaking, it is, however, probable that the great and free scope of his mind, which gradually raised him above all theocratic prejudices, and the boldness and breadth of his point of view, elevated immeasurably as it was above the theological scholasticism of his time, protected him in the essentials, which most interested him, from the confusing influences of the errors and superstitions of his age. Without a certain accommodation to the errors and prejudices of those whom he aims to affect and form, a teacher can have no hope of exerting a beneficial influence. And hence to reject at once

[1] Vie de Jésus, p. 125.

the idea that Jesus adapted himself to his time is ridiculous. Beyond all doubt he received into his sphere of thought the demonological notions of his day, universally prevalent among the Jews and especially among the Pharisees, and used them for his purposes. But how far he made them his own, how far he regarded them only symbolically, is quite another question. At all events, that he set forth no doctrine concerning Satan and demons, that he only occasionally made use of the popular notions on these subjects, that he often spoke of Satan especially in a strictly symbolical sense, that consequently no definite account can now be given of Jesus in relation to superterrestrial spirits, are points beyond all dispute.[1]

[For remarks designed to throw light upon the point referred to above, see Translator's note to ch. iv. p. 98. — TRANS.]

9. p. 120. How much more difficult it is to conceive of the cure of a leper by Jesus than of a lunatic, *Strauss* has shown clearly.[2] We have to conceive how a skin, which "in consequence of a thorough corruption of the blood had been eaten into by the most obstinate and malignant of eruptions was instantly rendered pure and sound by a word and a touch." But there is not therefore any reason why the narrative itself should be thrust back into the region of fable.[3] *Hase* calls attention to the fact that cutaneous diseases are often very movable, and remarks that no undeniable law of nature was violated by the power of Jesus over leprosy.[4] In reply to this remark, it may indeed be said that the sudden restoration, without any organic change, of an organism in a state of dissolution through an insidious poison, — not

[1] See my Christl. Dogmatik, Bd. II., p. 271 *et seq.*

[2] Leben Jesu, Bd. II., § 90.

[3] As *Strauss* thinks, according to the analogy of Ex. iv. 6; Num. xii. 10; 2 Kings v. 1.

[4] Leben Jesu, p. 137.

only of its corrupted vital fluids but also of the particles of the skin and body already destroyed by the poison, — could not possibly be conceived of as an effect of moral and spiritual power, but must rather be regarded as a positively new creation. But such a creation is irreconcilable with an historical mode of representing the person and work of Jesus, and presupposes the dogmatic idea of the Church concerning the person of Jesus. A mythical origin of our narrative is, however, for several reasons, not to be admitted. In the first place, the narrative is found in the original Mark, and Peter, from whom Mark had it, received it from Jesus himself.[1] Then again it contains particulars which cannot have been invented, such as the harsh manner of Jesus to the man whom he healed,[2] the forbidding him to tell any one of his cure, and the command to show himself to the priest and to make the offering directed by Moses. But how strong the disposition was to exaggeration in the evangelical tradition of miraculous cures is seen by comparing the first two Evangelists,[3] which designate the man who was healed simply as a λεπρός, with the third Evangelist, who describes him as an ἀνὴρ πλήρης λέπρας.[4] Hence it is not improbable that the leper, when he came to Jesus, was already in an advanced stage of cure, but received from Jesus an access of vital power greatly accelerating his restoration.

[The critics quoted above, *Strauss*, *Huse*, and Dr. Schenkel himself do not appear distinctly to recognize the fact, that according to the Evangelical narrative the power of Jesus was applied not to the disease but to the mind of the diseased man, which was put in a state of extraordinary susceptibility by confidence in Jesus. No limit can be set to the influence upon the body of a mind thus extraordinarily excited. — TRANS.]

10. p. 126. Opinions continue to vary materially as to the

[1] Mark i. 40.
[2] Mark i. 43.
[3] Mark i. 40; Matt. viii. 2.
[4] Luke v. 12.

sense in which Jesus applied to himself the title of "Son of Man." Those who see in this designation the characteristic title of the Messiah, refer not only to the book of Daniel,[1] but also to the book of Enoch, written probably some time before the Christian era.[2] *Hitzig* has shown, in regard to the Son of Man (כְּבַר אֱנָשׁ) in the book of Daniel, that the reference to the Messiah cannot be sustained.[3] There is in this passage, in the expression "Son of Man," the idea of a lowly condition; for he who comes from heaven, and even on account of his lofty descent was to be an exalted, divine person, has yet only the state of a man. The most plausible supposition is that the "Son of Man" in the book of Daniel is a personification of the Jewish people, the saints and righteous among them, reduced to a state of the deepest humiliation by Antiochus Epiphanes.[4] To this "people of the saints" (לְעַם קַדִּישֵׁי) the kingdom and dominion shall be given,[5] their kingdom shall be an everlasting kingdom, and all dominions shall serve and obey them. Accordingly, in conformity with the vision of the apocalyptic writer, the kingdom of the beasts shall fall to pieces, and the kingdom of lowly and oppressed humanity, of the down-trodden and persecuted saints of God, overthrown on earth, will descend from heaven as the true and everlasting kingdom of God. With this representation is connected the book of Enoch, the Messianic portion of which[6] begins with a description of the "Communion of the Righteous" by which mighty kings will be destroyed. This Communion of the Righteous, the "elect and holy children," will (as in the book of Daniel) descend from the high heavens and unite with the "chil-

[1] Dan. vii. 13.

[2] See *Ewald*, Ueber aethiopische Buch Henoch, Entstehung, Sinn und Zusammensetzung, Gött. 1854. *Hilgenfeld*, and especially *Volkmar*, is of directly an opposite opinion, — Beiträge zur Zeitschrift der deutschmorgenländischen Gesellschaft, 1860, 1, und Zeitschrift für wissenschaftliche Theologie, 1861, 2.

[3] Ex. Handbuch zum A. T. Bd. X., p. 115.

[4] Dan. vii. 21, 22, 25.

[5] Dan. vii. 27.

[6] *Dillmann*, Das Buch Henoch, p. 18; comp. ch. xxxiii. of the book.

dren of men."[1] They will thus be even as the sons of men; they will humble themselves to them. The Communion of the Saints, according to the book of Enoch, is pre-existent in heaven. Consequently it is not improbable that the so-called "Elect and Son of Man"[2] is only a personification of this heavenly and holy Communion descending to earth, for they are the same titles which are given to both. The designation of the "Elect" is used in the book of Enoch sometimes in the singular and sometimes in the plural,[3] and the honor and glory which shall be given in the one case, shall be given in the other also.[4] The Son of Man, whom the kings implore, upon whom they set their hope, before whom they shall at last be put to shame, can denote only the glorified Communion of the Saints itself,[5] which is evidently conceived of at one time as a pre-existent ideal Communion, and as such as the "Son of Man," and then again as the Communion chosen and sanctified from among the people of Israel.

Whether the passage referred to in the book of Daniel were present to the mind of Jesus, whether he were acquainted with the expectations expressed in the book of Enoch, cannot now be determined with certainty. The main point however is that he styled himself most explicitly the "Son of Man" at a point of time in his public career when he could not possibly have had any idea of making a public declaration of his Messiahship.

On the contrary, from the very beginning of his appearance in public, his express design was to establish a Communion resting upon principles, internal and moral, directly opposed to the theocratic system. He sought to build up the kingdom of God or the Communion of the saints, and in aiming to establish it among the poor and oppressed of the people, who alone seemed to him prepared and worthy of it, he unhesitatingly held himself to be the representative

[1] Das Buch Henoch, bei *Dillmann*, ch. xxxix.
[2] Ib., chs. xlv., xlvi., xlix., and liii.
[3] Ib., ch. xlviii.
[4] Ib., chs. l., lviii.
[5] Ib., chs. lxii., lxiii.

of this class, and took upon him the obloquy which in all times is the lot of those who in the spirit of childlike self-sacrifice devote themselves to the cause of the humblest. He was the "Man," the "child of Man." He had, — he sought, no other rank and no other title; least of all did he assume any royal appellation, either as a son of David or a Son of God. He was evidently conscious of being not an ordinary man like any other, but *the* Man, *the* Man who, in that age of universal confusion, when the despotism of the letter reigned far and wide, was bound to come forth from the midst of the people, in order to lift up and guide our misled and crushed human nature back upon the true path and up to God. He was conscious of being the true Man, renewed in the likeness of God, the Man who bore the poor people in his heart, the Man who in the lowly spirit of self-sacrifice offered himself to every pain and pang, the Man who, as *Baur* strikingly remarks,[1] considered it as his most particular calling to submit to all the sufferings and sacrifices inseparable from his work. That such a man, — of no account in the estimation of the distinguished Jewish theologues and hierarchs, — felt himself authorized to forgive sins, was certainly a matter of surprise to those whose moral and religious consciousness drew life only from tradition. However great the Sabbath, this man is yet lord of the Sabbath.[2] He had indeed no abiding place where to lay his head.[3] As Son of Man he is delivered into the hands of men.[4] He will come again in the brightness of heavenly glory.[5] Accordingly, that opinion has in itself most probability that considers Jesus as assuming this appellation in a sense wholly new, original, and peculiar. So far from connecting it with the Messianic prophecies of the Old Testament, he sought rather to keep far from his

1 Zeitschrift für wissenschaftliche Theologie, 3. Bd., 3, p. 280.
2 Mark ii. 28; Matt. xii. 8; Luke vi. 5.
3 Matt. viii. 20; Luke ix. 58.
4 Mark ix. 31; Matt. xvii. 22; Luke ix. 44.
5 Mark xiv. 62; Matt. xxvi. 64; Luke xxii. 69.

person all idea of any theocratic expectations as about to be fulfilled in him.[1]

11. p. 138. The narrative of the marriage feast at Cana has without any hesitation been pronounced a myth by *D. F. Strauss*,[2] who refers in justification of his opinion to the change of water into blood,[3] of bitter water into sweet by Moses,[4] and of unwholesome into wholesome water by Elisha.[5] *Baur* remarks, on the contrary,[6] that, where symbolism predominates so decidedly, where the mode of representation in its whole arrangement points in so orderly a manner to a determinate idea, the supposition of a myth can have no place. He on his part claims for the narrative rather a symbolico-typical character. The water is to be taken as the element and symbol of the Baptist, the wine as the symbol of the superiority of the Messiah over his forerunner, and the change of the water into wine signifies the transition and advance from the preparatory period of the Baptist to the epoch of the power and glory of the Messiah. The marriage feast itself, at which the Messiah appeared with his disciples in order to manifest his glory, is significant of the Messianic marriage feast. The Messiah is the bridegroom, who entertains the guests with the fulness of his gifts, and suffers nothing to be wanting that will contribute to their enjoyment. From the liberal distribution of the wine, the thought of the wine of the Supper is at least not to be wholly excluded. *Hilgenfeld*, again, is of the opinion that the miracle at Cana was introduced into the Fourth Gospel in the place of the Temptation related in the Synoptics, and that the Evangelist shows his design therein to represent Christ, at the very first, as exalted above all narrow-minded

[1] *Weisse*, Ueber die Zukunft der Ev. Kirche, p. 230.

[2] Leben Jesu, Bd. II., § 99; Leben Jesu für das Deutsche Volk, p. 506.

[3] Exod. vii. 15.

[4] Exod. xv. 23; see also Exod. xvii. 5; Num. xx. 8.

[5] 2 Kings ii. 19.

[6] *Baur*, kan. Evangelien, p. 121.

asceticism, and in the unbounded fulness of his wonder-working power.[1] But these modes of explanation are founded upon the erroneous supposition that the Fourth Gospel, under its dogmatic bias, absolutely invented the materials of its narratives. But as little reason as there is to suppose that the fourth Evangelist invented the accounts of the Baptist, of the calling of the disciples, the purification of the Temple, &c., — accounts which, although in different and more natural connections, are yet vouched for by the Synoptics, — just so little reason is there to suppose the narrative of the marriage feast at Cana to have been invented in order to bring Jesus into the scene as the Messianic bridegroom, or for the sake of exalting him by contrasting his elevation of mind with the narrow asceticism of the world-despising Baptist. In this passage the Fourth Gospel has used, in order to serve its purpose, an historical incident furnished by tradition.

That Jesus, as on other festal occasions,[2] took part in a marriage feast, and did not consider it derogatory to his personal dignity and his great work to provide a supply when the wine became exhausted, — this is the historical nucleus of the incident. The apparent harshness with which he spoke to his mother[3] is certainly no invention. It is very naturally explained by reference to the peculiar relation in which he then stood to the members of his own family.[4] It is very natural, when the true historical image of the Saviour had become gradually obscured by the subsequent dogmatic idea of his personal equality with God, that the considerate human sympathy with a wedding festivity, and the care shown by him for the enjoyment of the guests in providing wine for them when the wine failed, should seem to be inconsistent with his personal dignity, and that it should be sought to relieve this inconsistency by a miraculous change — a change produced by Almighty power — of water into wine. For the rest, the remark of *Lücke* is of weight:

[1] Die Evangelien, p. 248.
[2] Mark ii. 16; Matt. ix. 10; Luke v. 29.
[3] John ii. 4.
[4] Mark iii. 21; iii. 31.

"If there be no historical fact at the foundation of it, the origin of the narrative is unaccountable."[1] But it is entirely unhistorical to convert the miracle into an accelerated natural process, and to compare the wedding wine, produced by the divine creative power of Jesus, to exhilarating mineral water.[2] Notwithstanding his solemn protest against this natural process, *Meyer* virtually accepts it when he supposes a change of substance effected by the power of Jesus over natural laws, "according to a higher order of causality."[3] *Ewald*, on the other hand, gives up the miracle entirely, when he understands the narrative in the sense that the water became like wine of the best quality through the spirit of Jesus, and suggests the question, whether water will not everywhere become wine in the highest sense, even at this day, where the spirit of Christ has its full power.[4]

12. p. 155. The manner in which we have stated that Jesus chose the twelve disciples has been pronounced improbable. *Schleiermacher* supposes, that from the larger company of the hearers of Jesus a smaller select circle gradually separated itself, — that Jesus in fact did not choose his disciples, but the disciples chose him.[5] *Strauss*, on the other hand, finds in the number twelve certain traces of the primitive Christian legend, which, in accordance with its Jewish coloring, refers by this number to the twelve tribes of Israel, thus intimating to the Jews the Messianic office of Jesus; yet *Strauss* now considers only the sending forth of the Twelve during the lifetime of Jesus as doubtful, but not their being chosen by Jesus.[6] The supposition of *Schleiermacher* is at variance with the commanding personality of Jesus; the supposition of Strauss, with the

[1] Commentar über das Evangel. des Johannes, I. p. 477.

[2] Olshausen, Biblischer Commentar zu Joh. ii. 2 – 12; Neander, Leben Jesu, p. 373.

[3] Ex. Handbuch zum Evangel. des Johannes, p. 117.

[4] Geschichte Christus, p. 256.

[5] Ueber den Lucas, p. 88.

[6] Leben Jesu, Bd. I. § 71; Leben Jesu für das Deutsche Volk, p. 274

unanimity of all four Gospels in relation to the number of twelve, with the account in the book of Acts of the filling up of that number by a new choice,[1] and with the express testimony of the Apostle Paul to the appearance of Jesus after his crucifixion to the Twelve.[2] It certainly seems remarkable that almost all notices, with a few exceptions, of the later labors of the Twelve, have been lost. If Jesus only intended from among his adherents to make choice of the best and most able, we can hardly help thinking that he was not altogether fortunate in his choice. But if his aim especially was, by the choice of twelve,—called without reference to tribe, descent, or family,—to represent symbolically the *new* Israel created by the spirit of truth and freedom, in opposition to the theocratically ordered social body, then the idea that every one of the Twelve was bound to distinguish himself personally falls to the ground.[3]

13. p. 157. All the attempts of the harmonists, which aim at uniting the two accounts of the so-called Sermon on the Mount,[4] have been given up as fruitless and artificial. Whoever is bent upon maintaining his faith in the infallibility of the Scriptural writers by supposing, with *Ebrard*,[5] that the plain (Luke vi. 17) was a plain on the mountain, i. e. that the mountain was a plain, is welcome to do so; but the question, which of the two relations is the original, is worthy of consideration. That the first Evangelist does not give us the discourse originally uttered by Jesus is evident, —as was long since acknowledged by *Schulz*, *Sieffert*, and others,—from the fact that not a few of the sayings contained in the Sermon on the Mount in Matthew occur in the second and third Gospels in very different and more natural connections. Thus is it with the saying about salt, which in

[1] Acts i. 13. [2] 1 Cor. xv. 5.

[3] See the striking remarks of *Weisse*, Die Ev. Geschichte, Bd. I. p. 394.

[4] Matt. v. 1; Luke vi. 20.

[5] Wissenschaftliche Kritik, p. 350.

a somewhat different form is found in the second and third Gospels,[1] where it suits better the more advanced stage of development reached by the disciples. So also with the saying about light.[2] The saying that heaven and earth will sooner pass away than one tittle of the law, is found in another connection in Luke.[3] So is it likewise with what is said about being reconciled to an adversary.[4] The warning against temptation is found in a more appropriate connection in the first Gospel itself.[5] What is said of divorce has a better place in Mark[6] than in Matthew,[7] while in Luke it stands by itself.[8] The Lord's Prayer comes in more naturally in Luke[9] than in the first Gospel. The saying concerning the forgiveness of injuries, in the Sermon on the Mount,[10] is introduced more naturally afterwards in the same Gospel.[11] Luke brings in also in another connection the admonition to lay up treasure in heaven,[12] the saying concerning the inner light,[13] the warning against needless cares.[14] The warning against censoriousness in Matthew is found in quite another connection in Mark.[15] The admonition to prayer is likewise recorded, in the third Gospel,[16] in a wholly different connection from that in which it appears in the first. The command to enter the narrow gate was given, according to Luke,[17] upon the last journey of Jesus to Jerusalem. The saying about the good tree and the evil tree occurs twice in Matthew, and each time in a different connection.[18]

Hence it follows indubitably that the first Evangelist has put together, according to his judgment, in the so-called Ser-

[1] Mark ix. 49; Luke xiv. 34.
[2] Mark iv. 21; Luke xi. 33.
[3] Luke xvi. 17.
[4] Luke xii. 58.
[5] Matt. xviii. 8; comp. Matt. v. 29, and Mark ix. 47.
[6] Mark x. 11.
[7] Matt. v. 32.
[8] Luke xvi. 18.
[9] Luke xi. 1.
[10] Matt. vi. 14; see also Mark xi. 26.
[11] Matt. xviii. 35.
[12] Luke xii. 33.
[13] Luke xi. 34.
[14] Luke xii. 22.
[15] Matt. vii. 2; Mark iv. 24.
[16] Luke xi. 9; comp. Matt. vii. 7.
[17] Luke xiii. 23.
[18] Matt. vii. 16; xii. 33.

mon on the Mount, various sayings and precepts of Jesus, originally uttered upon very different occasions. That the discourse of Jesus is reported in its original form in the third Gospel has been denied by *D. F. Strauss* and others, but the arguments in support of this denial are not decisive. *Schleiermacher* supposes[1] that the woes which Luke reports as pronounced by Jesus were additions of the Evangelist; but it is, on the contrary, much more probable that the first Evangelist omitted them, out of consideration for such members of the Christian body as happened to be wealthy. It has been supposed that there is an hiatus in Luke's report of the Sermon on the Mount,[2] on account of the words ἀλλὰ ὑμῖν λέγω. But the admonition to love one's enemies forms a quite fitting contrast to the preceding woes, which were not to prevent our loving those on whom those woes are pronounced. The command to be patient and forbearing,[3] it is said, is quite too loosely introduced by the precept enjoining the love of enemies. But a patient and forbearing spirit is naturally connected with the disposition to love our enemies. The declaration that to love those who love us does not meet the standard of a disciple[4] is considered to have no connection in thought with what precedes, namely, "As ye would that men should do to you, do ye so to them." But it stands in closer connection with the whole section, beginning with the twenty-seventh verse (Luke vi.), the subject of which section is the obligation to love disinterestedly. So to love requires that, in the treatment of others, we should put them on the same footing with ourselves. Through the four sections, making up the discourse as given by Luke, there runs a thread nowhere broken, binding it into a whole. The first section, while condemning the opposite spirit, presents the ideal of the true disciple. The second section describes the conditions upon which the right spirit is preserved. The third is a warning against evil words; the fourth, against idle words.

[1] Ueber den Lucas, p. 70.
[2] Luke vi. 27.
[3] Luke vi. 29.
[4] Luke vi. 32.

The significance of the whole becomes full and clear only when considered in reference to the opposite theocratic system. We cannot, therefore, by any means admit that the first Evangelist has a better understanding of this discourse of Jesus, or one more complete and more exact in particulars.[1]

14. p. 194. The accounts of the miracles, which we have examined in the tenth chapter of the third section, show us how early the evangelical history began to be embellished with pious legends. All the efforts of the apologists avail nothing against this fact. In the storm upon the lake, according to Neander, it was by the divine power of his word that Jesus reduced the waves to instant stillness. But as, according to Neander's idea of Jesus, he was not all powerful like God, the question is not to be avoided, Whence then did Jesus obtain the ability and authority to exercise such "divine power"? Neander does not dispute that the divine idea of Christ would suffer no loss, even admitting that there was, on this occasion, no miracle strictly so called, no immediate effect wrought upon inanimate nature, but only an influence exercised directly upon the minds of the disciples.[2] But while he does not accept this view, he makes no attempt whatever to render intelligible the supernatural mode of explaining the miracle. *Ebrard* occupies the happiest position, inasmuch as from "the dogmatic (?) stand-point of the Bible" he finds no difficulty whatever.[3] *Hase*, on the other hand, remarks[4] how easily may it have happened that the Messiah, in his symbolical manner, allayed the storm of fear in the minds of his Apostles, and that the ground of his confidence came afterwards to be misunderstood. *Meyer* pronounces such an attempt at explaining the miracle a "naturalizing" of the history, and, from his supernaturalistic point of view, which is akin to that of *Ebrard*, is of the opinion that the allaying of the

[1] As Neander, e. g. maintains, Leben Jesu Christi, p. 455.
[2] Leben Jesu, p. 367.
[3] Wissenschaftliche Kritik, p. 322.
[4] Leben Jesu, p. 138.

storm is to be ascribed to the indwelling *divine* power of Jesus, in view of which, it is no more difficult to attribute to him an influence over the elements than to ascribe to him power over the bodily organism.[1] In opposition to such an unthinking supernaturalism, *Strauss* observes very justly[2] that this miracle then presupposes not merely that Jesus had power psychologically over the mind and so over the body, but that he was able to act with immediate effect upon unintelligent, inanimate nature. The former implies human instrumentality, the latter requires divine omnipotence. An "omnipotent" Christ is not a personality historically representable.

In the cure of the demoniac of Gadara, *Neander* is also of the opinion that "from a cause unknown to us" the herd became terrified, and was driven over the steep shore;[3] and *Hase* sees in the destruction of the herd an accident, quite unforeseen and very possible in animals so shy and gregarious.[4] Even *Meyer*, notwithstanding his otherwise incorrigible supernaturalism, conceives himself compelled to regard the narrative as of a legendary character in part, as he cannot bring himself to see in the demoniacs persons really possessed.[5] But *Delitzsch* shows himself of a stouter faith in the second edition of his "System of Biblical Psychology,"[6] where, in speaking of the demons in the Gadarenes, he expresses himself to this effect, that "they (the demons), concealing themselves in living bodies and spending their fury upon corporeal creatures, felt a restraint put upon the frenzy with which their purely spiritual natures were seized and convulsed." Jesus, he says, granted these demons what they implored of him, in order that the two possessed men might be the more thoroughly convinced of their miraculous deliverance. But that must have been an extremely weak

[1] Ex. Handbuch zu Matt. viii. 23–27.
[2] Leben Jesu, § 97.
[3] Leben Jesu Christi, p. 361.
[4] Leben Jesu, p. 139.
[5] Ex. Handbuch zum Evangelium des Matthäus, p. 212.
[6] P. 298.

faith, the strengthening of which required the destruction of a whole herd of swine in the sea. And ought not the cure of the men, effected by the influence of Jesus, to have proved their miraculous restoration far more convincingly?

The common supernatural idea, entertained by the Church, of the feeding of the five thousand, is embarrassed by very special difficulties. While *Meyer* has no hesitation in supposing the presence of legendary elements in the account of the Gadarene maniacs, it is not easy to see why he should hesitate to suppose the same thing in the story of the miraculous feeding of the multitude. In the first instance, as in the second, the supposition is certainly in opposition to the Evangelical statements. The idea that there were no possessed persons and that the demons did not really, at the command of Jesus, enter the swine, contradicts the letter of the Evangelical narrative even more directly than does the idea that Jesus did not, strictly speaking, miraculously multiply the bread and fishes, since, at least from what the fourth Gospel tells us of what Jesus said, we may conclude what it was that really happened.

Whoever maintains the possibility of a creative (i. e. of omnipotent) power in Jesus, — whereby he restored dead bodies to life and multiplied substances artificially prepared (like bread),— and at the same time is content to believe with *Meyer* in "its complete incomprehensibility," certainly is not to be envied from a philosophical point of view for his mental repose; neither has he any cause to boast of the "objective principles" of his method of Scriptural interpretation. The one purpose of the study of the Gospels is nothing less than to gather therefrom an historically true idea of the character of Jesus. But how can we so much as speak of a human character in Jesus, if, almighty like God, he creates, destroys, and multiplies whatever he pleases and as he pleases?

In regard to the miracle of the feeding of the multitude, *Neander* gives up all attempts at explanation. He sees in it the climax of the miraculous. The miraculous power of

Jesus supplies here the failing powers of nature; he uses it to make much out of little. The difficulty certainly is not in the least degree obviated by *Neander's* leaving the incident to stand by itself as utterly incomprehensible, and attempting to draw from it a practical significance to the effect that the power of Christ is represented as working in all ages, in things physical and spiritual, to accomplish, through the spirit proceeding from him, the greatest ends with slight means.[1] And the allegorical interpretation of the event is essentially only a modestly disguised attempt to render the miracle, unintelligible in itself, palatable to the intelligent and thoughtful.

We cannot, however, agree with *Strauss* that this story of the feeding of the multitude is a myth, — an opinion which he sets forth with singular acuteness. It is intrinsically improbable that an evangelical narrative, so strongly certified in its main features, should have had no historical occasion, and should be a pure invention. Neither can we understand how the account of Mark, coming directly from Peter, should twice relate, with some differences, the same particulars. The story is not to be traced back to a parable told by Jesus,[2] as such a parable would have contained some hint of its figurative character, otherwise so very liable to be misunderstood;[3] there would have been some trace of other parables, told in connection with this, of a like obscure character.[4] Much more probable is it that the spiritual nourishment, which Jesus gave to the multitude gathered around him in the wilderness, and which he likened to the physical nourishment afforded by the manna of the Old Covenant, was converted by a marvel-loving legend into a physical refreshment of the people by a miraculous increase of the food at hand. The feeding of the multitude actually took place, and in consequence of the provident arrangements of Jesus. That the disciples were sent out by Jesus to pro-

1 Leben Jesu Christi, p. 381.

2 *Weisse*, Evangelische Geschichte, Bd. I. p. 513.

3 Mark viii. 14; Matt. xvi. 5.

4 Comp. Mark vi. 30 *et seq.*

cure such provisions as were wanting admits of no doubt.[1] It is certain also that Jesus distributed the food by the hands of his disciples. And, as the host on the occasion and head of the company, he offered the customary thanks.[2] That the later legend should make use of these particulars, in order thereby to render more credible the idea of the supernatural multiplication of the food by Jesus, who blessed it and gave it to his disciples to distribute, lies in the nature of the case. Either Mark, — going beyond the statements of Peter in this as in other miraculous relations, — took the story in this shape which had become current in his time, or the person who worked it over again after Mark added to it the miraculous exaggeration.

[The miraculous relations commented upon in the foregoing narrative are of an extremely difficult character, and admit of no entirely satisfactory explanation. It certainly is not absolutely impossible that the alleged action of Jesus upon inanimate bodies may be due to occult relations of matter and mind. But so understood, Dr. Schenkel considers them as involving the idea that Jesus was possessed of omnipotence. But no such idea was created in the minds of those who witnessed these miracles. Nor does it follow that his power was absolutely unlimited, because it transcended ordinary limits. At the same time, whether he actually laid the storm on the lake is doubtful. The account comes from persons confessedly in a state of great excitement at the time, — a circumstance that admonishes us to take the story with caution. Their fears may have magnified the storm, and in a like manner the sense of safety may have exaggerated the sudden subsidence of the storm. However regarded, the incident illustrates the moral idea of Jesus. As to the story of the Gadarene maniac, with all its difficulties it shows strong "historical traits." The case was evidently an extreme one, as the insanity of the poor creature did not

[1] Mark vi. 37.

[2] Mark vi. 40 ; Mark viii. 6 ; Matt. xiv. 19 ; Luke ix. 16 ; John vi. 11.

at once yield to the influence of Jesus. The idea of sending the demons into the swine looks like the cunning suggestion of a madman, who felt that, in making it, he was speaking in character with the *unclean* spirits that he believed possessed him, and who also wanted ocular proof that he was rid of the demons. The violence of his mania is shown in his belief that he was the victim not of one but of a legion of evil spirits. Is not the destruction of the swine to be accounted for without supposing that any extraordinary effect was wrought on them? In regard to the feeding of the five thousand, it is remarkable, if there were an actual, miraculous increase of the food, that the narratives do not state the fact more explicitly. The only articles of food mentioned are the loaves and fishes which a young man (not apparently one of the disciples) had brought with him. It could hardly be that this young stranger was the only provident person in the multitude. Would not the feeding of such a crowd under such circumstances be an incident to awaken wonder, even though there were nothing really miraculous about it? While it excited wonder, it does not seem to have produced the effect of a supernatural display of power at the time. — TRANS.]

END OF VOL. I.

Cambridge: Stereotyped and Printed by Welch, Bigelow, & Co.

CINCINNATI BIBLE COLLEGE & SEM. LIBRARY
232.9 v.1 main
Schenkel, Daniel/The character of Jesus
3 4320 00009 1613

232.9
S324c
v. 1
32914
Schenkel, Daniel
The Character of Jesus Portrayed

THE CINCINNATI BIBLE SEMINARY LIBRARY
A. No. 32914
D. D. No. 232.9
S324c
v.1

OEMCO